THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

The Rev. L. E. Elliott-Binns, D.D., is an assiduous recorder of religious thought, and many are grateful to him. His most recent work, *Divine Providence and Human Destiny*,[1] is timely and topical. As he says, 'To sensitive souls the problem of human destiny is often a perennial torment; but in times of crisis and catastrophe, such as those in which we live, its area is immensely extended, and few there are who escape. It is not only philosophers and theologians, scientists and historians, who are compelled to ask if the universe has any purpose, but simple souls in every walk of life, and especially the multitudes whose accustomed round has been rudely disturbed.'

The first chapter, which treats of 'Providence in the Bible,' is a useful summary of the outlook upon the world of the Biblical writers, through whom there came in the fullness of time the culminating revelation of the love of God in Jesus Christ the Son. The second chapter, treating of 'Providence in History,' attempts to survey the world as it is seen by the historians, for whom history is in Carlyle's words—'the true epic and the universal divine scripture.'

Special reference is made in this chapter to St. Augustine's attempt to construct a Christian philosophy of history. According to him, it is not fate or chance which controls the fortunes of men and nations, but the God of the Christians. It is He who determines the greatness of empires and the duration of their power. And His purpose is the establishment of the Kingdom of God. And those who co-operate with Him in the working out of His purpose may or may not enjoy temporal prosperity.

But let us turn to a consideration of the third and final chapter, whose subject is 'Co-operation with Providence.' If history is to be looked upon as the working out of a divine plan, that divine plan is—as, for example, Vico affirmed—actually made effective by the use of human agencies.

First, we are asked to observe the conditions of co-operation, if we are to be more than mere instruments in the hand of God. Our primary task is not to work out some plan of our own but to wait upon God, that we may learn His plan. The will of God must be the predominant consideration in all planning for a new order. As Toynbee points out, the mediæval economic order had its origin in the efforts of Gregory the Great at the end of the sixth century, and it rested on 'solid religious foundations'; and it would be most unlikely that the vaster structure which we must build in our day can ever be securely based upon 'the rubble foundation of sordid economic interests.'

Mr. Gollancz, who is a Jew, is also persuaded that a moral and religious faith can alone provide a firm foundation for any stable order, and is generous enough to hope for the co-operation of the Christian Church, 'no longer divorced from politics,' with humanists or stoics who accept the Christian ethic. On this our author is careful to comment, that the ideal of the Church must be wider in scope than that of the humanist or stoic with whom the Church is asked to co-operate; its efforts cannot be limited to working for material and social improvements and the amelioration of evil conditions. A higher service than this must draw out its energies; men's minds must be lifted to that ideal world where the true, the good, and the beautiful have their real existence.

Secondly, we are asked to observe more closely what is the work of the Church in relation to the reconstruction of society. The Church must

[1] S.P.C.K.; 4s. net.

strive to restore God and the things of the spirit to their rightful place in human life. It must also seek, without direct intervention in party politics, to exercise influence in favour of all efforts to establish a just social and economic order; and this it will do by proclaiming principles rather than by drafting definite programmes. Such a statement as the Ten Peace Points is an admirable instance in this connexion. But if the Church is to take due part in the work of reconstruction, what we need most of all in our time is an all-embracing revival of spiritual life.

Lastly, we are asked to observe more fully what is the work of the individual. The Christian must see that the revival of religion and the restoration of God and the things of the spirit to their rightful place in the scheme of man's affairs depend upon the recognition by individuals of their personal responsibility. When in 1930 the Church in China inaugurated its Five Years' Plan, all those who took part in it were asked to pray every day: 'O God, revive Thy Church in China, and begin with me.'

In urging upon his readers the importance of this aspect of the work of the individual, our author warns against the sins of spiritual insincerity and spiritual pride, and advocates (here he addresses parsons in particular) an earnest pursuit of knowledge, not so much for its own sake, as for the practical end of helping others. It is true that, as the late Professor Burkitt once said, a teaching Church can never be a dying Church; but a teaching Church must also be a learning Church.

Some years ago the Rev. Canon A. E. Baker wrote a popular book entitled 'Christianity and Science in the Twentieth Century' which has long been out of print. He has returned to the subject in *Science, Christianity and Truth*,[1] a book which is well fitted to give in a popular form much useful information and guidance on the great subjects of which it treats.

Canon Baker has the courage to affirm, 'I know of no natural law discovered by science which contradicts any Christian dogma; on the contrary, the scientific attitude should help a man to reverence the truth and save him from credulity and superstition. And I am certain that the Christian faith, rightly held, will save men from misusing the powers and misinterpreting the knowledge that science gives, because it alone can give men the inspiration and sanctions without which they will sink to exploiting the world for their own sake instead of serving the world for God's sake.'

[1] Eyre & Spottiswoode; 6s. net.

The book provides sound reasons in support of this belief. It is impossible here to follow the writer through the wide fields he traverses, but it may be of interest to give some notes on the chapter in which he deals with the limitations of science.

The first limitation under which science labours, like religion and every form of human thought, is that it rests on certain fundamental principles or postulates which cannot be proven but must be taken for granted. The ancients said the earth rested on the back of an elephant and the elephant stood on the back of a tortoise, but what did the tortoise stand on? In other words, you may carry your chain of reasoning as far back as you can but you must in the end come to a halt at some ultimate which does not admit of being proved. It would hardly be worth while adverting to this were it not that it is popularly supposed that science differs from religion in being able to give a reason for everything. 'God is just a postulate,' says the sceptic of the street corner, ignorant of the fact that the uniformity of Nature and the rationality of the universe are in the same sense postulates. They have never been proved, nor ever can be. Only Omniscience could give an absolute guarantee of their truth. Yet they are dogmas which all scientists accept and on which they confidently build. 'The late Lord Balfour reiterated, throughout a long life, the challenging assertion that people criticise and reject religion and theology because they start from unprovable assumptions, although they accept with humble docility the world-view of science based on assumptions equally unprovable.'

The next limitation is that science can describe the *What* of things, but never the *Why?* and *Wherefore?* 'There are certain *data* of the senses —things that are *there*—and we have to start by accepting them as they are.' Science cannot tell us why things are what they are. A generation ago science taught that the world began with a shower of indestructible atoms falling through space with a slight inclination towards one another. But to the questions why there should be these atoms, why they should fall, why they should have an inclination, no answer could be given. To-day, science, having broken up the atom, offers us a primæval fiery mist with a tendency to revolve, but why there should be

such a fire-mist and why it should tend to revolve science cannot tell. This holds good all along the line of scientific investigation. Evolution, for example, is no substitute for or explanation of creation. Darwin began with a world in which there was life with a spontaneous power of variation governed by natural selection, but why there should be such a world, where these powers of variation and selection came from, were questions he could not attempt to answer. 'Beneath and behind and within all scientific reasoning is the irrational *fact*, the brute existent —that has to be taken for granted. . . . The data of sense, natural laws, the existence of the universe, the laws of thought, all are what they are, and we do not know *why*; and we do not know why they are at all. The existence of the actual, Troeltsch says, must be referred to the arbitrary *fiat* of the Deity.'

Further, in studying the *What* of things, science cannot grasp the whole but is able only to give a partial and incomplete description. The scientist is like a fisherman casting his net into the sea. He can only bring to land what the meshes of his net will hold; everything else will slip through and escape. And he would be a very foolish fisherman who concluded that there was nothing more in the sea than his net brought out. Yet into this very error scientists are apt to fall.

The scientist's net is fitted to catch the material and let the spiritual slip through. 'Science *spatializes* everything. It measures mass by the place of a balance-pointer on a graduated scale. It measures electricity and magnetism with a galvanometer—*i.e.* by the movement of a spot of light on a scale. It measures time by the movement of a hand on a dial.' However refined its instruments of measurement may become, they are in principle a yard stick and a clock. But manifestly such instruments of measurement are useless in ethics, art and religion, or, as we say generally, the world of values. Science, therefore, as Professor Julian Huxley says, is morally and emotionally neutral. 'It sets out to describe and understand, not to appraise or to assign values.' But in the actual world in which men live and die, values are all important. 'That science cannot deal with them is only a proof that it is an abstraction from the full reality of the actual world.'

Further, the scientist's net is constructed to catch fish in shoals. In plain words, science deals with classes rather than individuals. For example, science observing resemblances in certain trees classifies them as oak trees and puts on record the general characteristics of the class. This work of classification is immensely useful for certain purposes, and without such classification the great body of scientific knowledge could not be built up. But every oak tree is much more than merely the member of a class. It has an individuality, for no two oak trees are alike. Now for purposes of human knowledge and practical utility the individuality of the oak tree may be of no importance. But the case is quite different when higher forms of life are in question, especially human life. Here individuality is all important. All that science can tell about human beings as a class gives us but little knowledge of the individual man, woman, or child. It takes no account of personal feelings, desires, ambitions, hopes, and fears—in short, all that gives colour and value to human life. Bertrand Russell is bold enough to say repeatedly that it is possible to explain the behaviour of human beings on the assumption that they are merely bodies without minds.

This terrible blindness on the part of science to the great impalpable realities has the most serious practical consequences. Science, just because it ignores the individual soul which Christianity holds as of infinite value, takes a casual and cynical attitude towards the rights of the human person. It lumps him in the mass, shapes him according to the common pattern, standardizes and mechanizes him. This is one of the most imminent dangers that threaten human well-being and which has already had disastrous effects on a vast scale. It is the result, as Archbishop Temple has pointed out, of the undue predominance of the scientific outlook which, however true and valuable within its own sphere, has no just claim completely to dominate the whole realm of human thought and action.

A book with the curious title, *Biblical Politics*, and the perfectly simple and revealing sub-title, 'Studies in Christian Social Doctrine,' by the Rev. Alexander Miller,[1] has a considerable doctrinal interest and a particular and definite social challenge. We are not concerned here with the first. Mr. Miller says that part of his book has been written with a clerical collar on, part with it off. The first three chapters were written with the collar on. They discuss the place of Christianity in history and its relation to economics and social problems. In the last two chapters the author obviously laid aside the hampering clerical appendage. And in the last chapter Mr. Miller must have shed his coat and waistcoat also.

[1] S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net.

It is this last chapter to which we call attention. It begins with an insistence on the inadequacy of preaching without the testimony of obedience and life. People will not believe in the Kingdom of Heaven unless they find in their midst colonists of Heaven who live by its law. That there is a failure on the part of the Church to win men no one, he says, denies. The influence of the Church is confined more and more to a limited group. Broadly speaking, the working masses of the country have fallen out of relation to the Church. The controlling upper classes are related to it only in a patronizing fashion. It is the middle class and lower middle class who form the bulk of its membership. Of these Mr. MILLER has a poor opinion politically.

In the matter of evangelism we are losing ground, and no amount of fervour or preaching ability will regain it, for the simple reason that whether or not the gospel can get a hearing depends not on evangelical fervour but on our conduct as a Church, not on purity of doctrine or seemliness of worship but on our dealing with finance, with economics and with the concrete relation of the Church to a world torn by class conflict. The old 'come to Jesus' appeal was pietistic and sometimes snobbish, and we ought to acknowledge that that kind of preaching is 'through.' The Jesus who is indifferent to the shameful weight of poverty and to social equity and whose spokesmen are complacent parasites on a society perishing from the weight of its own injustice does not appeal to the masses.

The Church will never get a hearing again until as a community it orders its life in conformity with the gospel. The Christian evangelist is not a solitary. He is a member of the Christian company and his success or failure is bound up with the character of the Church's life. It is very difficult to realize how grave is the just reproach which the modern world brings against us just because our corporate life is in such contradiction to the mind of Christ. These seem general and perhaps wild statements. But Mr. MILLER does not shirk the particular, and his particular *bête noire* is the relation of the Church to finance and especially the basis on which it pays its agents.

The possession of 'preaching gifts' or culture or administrative ability determines a man's salary. A selection body quite frankly realizes that the kind of man it can get depends on the salary it can offer. An extra £50 will secure a better man. That is to say the Church generally, and the ministry in particular, do not dream of acting on any but the ordinary pagan commercial standards of the world at large. But the resistance of the masses to the witness of the gospel can be broken only if there are those prepared to identify themselves with the people to whom they dare to preach. 'The presence of rich men and poor men together in the same Christian congregation is a blasphemous denial of the gospel. The gospel can be preached to the poor, but only by poor men. Why otherwise should the poor listen?'

Of course, all this applies to the layman as much as to the minister. And Mr. MILLER realizes this and definitely demands that the Christian should face up to the requirements of the gospel on him as an individual as well as on the Church as a community. And plainly he must ask himself what in concrete terms does economic justice require of individual men? (The author has already discussed the Christian ordering of the social system.) If they decide that as a matter of plain justice they must take no more than their fair share of material goods, what ought their behaviour to be? The answer is given in the 'national average spending' movement. The national average form of personal and social discipline does not profess to be a complete solution of the economic or the social problem; it simply offers a technique by which those who wish to embody economic justice in their dealings with their fellows can act on the basis of valid economic data, handling their income in such a fashion that they take only their share out of the community's common stock of spending power.

During 1941 in Great Britain spending power was distributed at the rate of £140 per adult person, and that (so far as can be gathered from Mr. MILLER'S language) seems to be all that a Christian can take for himself, 'returning to the community, in the most constructive fashion possible, any surplus income which comes into his hands.' Mr. MILLER at once adds, 'Manifestly this raises all kinds of practical questions—about support of dependants, about educational costs, about incidence of taxation, and so on.' But he does not grapple with these very practical questions. He only says that once the basic obligation is accepted the difficulties of procedure will be found far from insurmountable. The main difficulty, however, is about the basic obligation, and about this there will be two minds among the most candid and loyal of disciples. About the central duty of a Christian to handle his economic relations in a Christian way there will be no dispute, and Mr. MILLER'S vigorous challenge will bring us up against this duty in no uncertain fashion.

Cults of To-day.

HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

I. Spiritualism.

By Professor L. W. Grensted, D.D., Oxford.

Spiritualism is a subject about which it is easy to form strong opinions, and still easier to write articles, if one does not know too much or think too hard. It is actually one of the most important fields of human investigation, and yet in none is there more illusion, more actual fraud, wilful or unconscious, more self-deception, more liability to substitute emotion for judgment and desire for evidence. Nevertheless, I believe it to be true to say that of those who have taken any serious trouble to understand and to verify the facts there are few who do not feel that ordinary scientific explanations are inadequate. We do seem to find ourselves faced with potentialities of the spirit and with potentialities arising from sources beyond the individual spirit which demand a new kind of approach, a new handling of evidence, and even what may seem at first to be a new credulity. For if there is new truth to be received it is certain that only those whose minds are open will be able to receive it.

A good deal of confusion is caused by the very different senses in which the word 'spiritualism' is used. For very many people it is now frankly a religion, in varying degree friendly or hostile to ordinary orthodox Christianity. Frequently the claim is made that it gives a truer and a more far-reaching interpretation of the facts of the New Testament than those enshrined in Christian teaching and currently accepted in the Churches. With this claim has gone the establishment of a large number of Spiritualist places of worship, where services of a definitely religious character are conducted under the leadership of mediums or clairvoyants, purporting to be under the guidance of spirits. Traditionally, however, and more commonly, Spiritualism is associated rather with the séance than with anything that could be called an act of corporate worship, and is regarded simply as the belief that messages can be obtained through suitable mediums from our departed friends. Many of those who fully accept this belief and who make a regular practice of attending séances see no difficulty at all in combining this with normal and loyal Church membership. Many more find in it a source of comfort and interest without combining it with any truly religious interpretation of life. Finally, Spiritualism may be regarded as a scientific hypothesis, accepting inter-communication with spirits as the most adequate explanation of a large number of recorded facts, an explanation which still remains necessary, so it is held, when every allowance has been made for emotion, deception, and misunderstanding.

The Christian who is trying to make up his mind about Spiritualism must be careful to distinguish between these three main senses in which the term can be used. For Spiritualism as a religion obviously raises difficulties which are not present in Spiritualism as a science, and Spiritualism as a naïve and emotional means of domestic consolation may be quite innocuous or may be a very serious source of danger, according to the emphasis laid upon it.

It should be noted that Spiritualism has by now given rise to a very considerable body of literature, some of it of high value and of obvious integrity, whatever interpretation may be adopted. Much of this is of the nature of evidence, but there is also an elaborate and fairly clear-cut body of explanatory teaching, which is regarded by many Spiritualists with almost the same respect as that accorded by Christians to sound and tried theology. This is in part due to the work of scientists, of whom a number, such as Sir William Crookes and Sir Oliver Lodge, have been men of great distinction, who have tried to give form to the hypotheses involved if the control of mediums by departed spirits is accepted. Much of it is based upon communications received through mediums, and these, with some small amount of variation, give a remarkably coherent account of the after-life, and of the progress and development of the spirit through its various spheres. It is a striking fact that this cosmology of the after-life has a very long history, appearing in various writers, Pythagorean, Gnostic, and occult generally, for perhaps as much as three thousand years. More explanations than one can be given for this occult tradition, but it is, at the least, one of very great interest and significance, whether what it reveals is the hereafter or the workings of our unconscious mind, perhaps at levels which lie below the divisions which separate us as individuals.

In this teaching a distinction should be made between general truths of positive value and more or less pictorial hypotheses. I do not myself think that sufficient justice has been done to the continued and consistent emphasis laid throughout the teaching of the so-called spirit guides upon justice and love. The teaching on justice is in some ways akin to the Hindu doctrine of Karma,

but is often stated in more personal and less mechanical terms. In principle it is simply the teaching that what we do does in fact work out its consequences here and hereafter, and that it is upon the acceptance and not in any evasion of those consequences that our spiritual progress depends. This is, of course, not the Christian doctrine of justification by faith, but it is the necessary complement of that doctrine, as was pointed out by St. James, and implied by Jesus Himself.

With this emphasis on the law of consequence goes an even more important emphasis upon love as the sole and triumphant operative principle in the whole universe. Nothing has struck me more than the continued insistence upon this in the communications which are given through mediums, and its freedom from contamination by other principles. The charge is sometimes laid against communications of this kind that they are banal and sentimental, that they tell us nothing new, and that, in fact, they are really rather unworthy of their alleged source. That charge seems to me grossly unfair. The message that God is love is the central message of Christianity, and if Christians have mixed that message up with other things, as only too often they have, all that I can say is that they need recalling to the fundamental simplicity of their faith, and no teaching which so recalls them ought to be called shallow or unworthy.

But mixed with this lofty teaching there is much else of very different value. There is a whole system of doctrines about etheric and astral bodies and the corresponding spheres. There is a great deal of insistence upon paranormal phenomena of all sorts, ranging from the horse-play of poltergeists, and the curious material extruded from the body of certain mediums and known as ectoplasm, to such well-established phenomena as thought-reading and telepathy. There is also the whole immense system of popular belief which has grown up around the people, often completely above suspicion as to their sincerity, who are capable of acting as mediums, or who, more broadly, have what are called psychic powers. In this vaguer form, indeed, there is an almost general acceptance of the position that such powers exist, and that they constitute a source of knowledge which is not limited by the normal control of our senses and our reason. In all this territory we are moving in the sphere of something quite different from the spiritual. This is not a matter of religion but of science. We have a whole mass of observed facts, some common and some rare and unfamiliar, and all this pattern of Spiritualist hypotheses is just an attempt at scientific interpretation. The etheric body, for example, is simply a way of putting together a number of observed facts. It is a hypothesis, and, indeed, not as good a hypothesis now as it was twenty years ago, when scientists still accepted the ether itself. The astral body brings together certain other facts. But neither really gives us any explanation, and scientific verification of the actual existence of either etheric or astral bodies, as entities, is wholly lacking.

In general the situation seems to be that both the evidence for these so-called paranormal phenomena and their interpretation is still a matter of the very greatest obscurity. The whole business is almost hopelessly confused by the immense amount of fraud which meets the investigator at every turn. Unfortunately many Spiritualists have been quite unnecessarily sensitive upon this point, and Spiritualism has been very much discredited by attempts to defend outposts of all kinds. The faking of spirit-photographs, the imitation of ectoplasm with cheese-muslin, swallowed and regurgitated, the pretended materialization of flowers and other objects, have been so repeatedly exposed as to cast doubt and more than doubt upon all supposed phenomena of the kind. And why Spiritualists should resent the exposure it is hard to see; for these things do nothing to reinforce their main contention. They only introduce confusion, and help nobody to any real conviction, still less to any revelation of spiritual things. Their whole tendency is to introduce a materialistic rather than a spiritual element, and much that has been written about them seems to involve the explanation of spirit as a kind of matter, rather than to see in matter the vehicle of spirit.

Quite apart from that fundamental difficulty of theory there is the even more serious practical danger of the very human tendency to seek for signs rather than for the deeper spiritual values and truths. It is not for Christians to be uncharitable or censorious about this matter when they remember that for some eighteen hundred years belief in the Christian revelation was regarded as substantiated by miracle and the fulfilment of prophecy, each being regarded as authoritative precisely because it was irrational. There is even an element in the New Testament itself which, as it stands, would to-day be regarded not as a ground of faith, but as matter for investigation by the Society for Psychical Research. Yet our Lord Himself had warned His followers against this very thing: 'Neither will they believe though one rose from the dead.' Even the Resurrection, simply as the revitalizing of a dead body, is not a ground of faith. In itself, indeed, it was indistinguishable from any psychical materialization. The point did not lie in its strangeness, or its

reversal of the natural order whereby man's body is liable to death. It lay in something else, the intense and self-authenticating release of spiritual power in which the living presence of Jesus Himself made itself known to His followers and friends. It is so that He makes Himself known still. The signs come second and not first, and those who let their whole attention dwell upon the signs are more than likely to be deluded.

It is certainly here, even more than in the widespread openings for sheer fraud, that the main dangers of Spiritualism are to be seen. The traffic in signs, the miracle-mongering not for the sake of love but for the sake of the miracle, the quest for manifestations and the rest, can become a most perilous distraction, separating the spirit alike from God and from the everyday world in which God's work must be done. That which has been one of the greatest dangers in the history of Christianity is no less a danger when revived in Spiritualist practice. It should be added in fairness that many Spiritualists know this perfectly well, and that the better Spiritualist literature is full of warnings against this emphasis on the spectacular.

But when all this is said, something still remains. The sincerity and directness of the fundamental teaching involved is quite untouched by these confusions of hypothesis and practice. And, more than that, there is always the need of some hypothesis sufficient to cover the immense range of facts which are presented to us by the long and fully attested series of communications received through mediums, many of them people of the highest character and of transparent sincerity, and often without any concern for money or notoriety.

There are only two explanations for which anything can be said at all, for we can certainly dismiss the belief, sometimes held, that the whole business is fraudulent.

The first of these is that the manifestations are due to the working of the minds of the medium and of those about him at deep unconscious levels. If this explanation is combined with the acceptance of telepathy, or the direct transference of mental contents from one mind to another, it is a very far-reaching explanation indeed. Modern analytical research has shown not only the unexpected richness of the unconscious material in our minds but also its immense and creative energy, its power to influence our conduct and even to mould the physical and mental patterns of our lives. No psychologist would venture to say that we have done more than begin to plumb the immense mysteries and resources of these hidden regions of the mind. Further, it seems to be true that at the deepest levels our separation as individuals is not so clear-cut and definite as it is when we come nearer to consciousness. It is a well-known fact that in some mystical experiences, and also in some experiences induced by hypnosis or drugs, the powers of the mind itself act with a suggestion of otherness which is, at the time, quite overwhelming. It is probably true that some at least, perhaps the majority, of what appear to be direct communications through mediums have as their explanation this fact of the unconscious. Certainly it is true that much of the material of these communications must be derived from the mind of the medium or by telepathy from other minds with which the medium is in contact. In no other way could the messages take any shape at all. This, it may be added, is fully recognized in the more thoughtful expositions of Spiritualism, where the spirit communicator is regarded as only able to give his message by drawing upon the mind of the medium for suitable ideas to be its vehicle. The very fact that so many of the communications come through in a halting form may be taken as some confirmation of this view.

But explanations based upon the unknown resources of the unconscious do not seem adequate to explain nearly all the facts. In particular, there have been a number of messages, received quite independently by different mediums, which only make sense when they are put together. These have been called 'cross-correspondences,' and no theory either of the unconscious mind or of telepathy seems to account for them at all. Even more convincing, though less surprising and spectacular, are the multitude of experiences in which there is a warm sense of direct personal contact, the messages received being unimportant and secondary compared with the assurance that some relative or friend is actually present. These experiences seem equally incapable of proof or disproof, but the evidence for them is far wider than that afforded by professional mediums or formal séances. There seems to be no particular reason to doubt that they have, and ought to have, their own place in the pattern of human life.

So much has, in fact, been widely recognized among Christians in every age, and there is no reason why Christians should be afraid of it. But this does not mean that such experiences can be controlled or organized, and still less that they should be regarded as of primary importance. The desire for them may only too easily become a distraction, taking our minds away from Christ. As ever, the way for the Christian is the way of prayer and service, in which the presence of Christ Himself becomes more and more an abiding reality. Within that single loyalty it is sometimes given to us to be in conscious contact with the living fellowship of the Communion of Saints, wherein is no death.

Literature.

THOMAS CHALMERS.

Thomas Chalmers and the Disruption, by Professor Watt, of the Church History Chair, New College, Edinburgh University (Nelson; 12s. 6d. net). If you were to mention the title of this book in any company of young Scots to-day I fear you would only provoke the questions, 'What was the Disruption?' and 'Who was Thomas Chalmers?' So completely has the fame of that critical event faded from the mind of this generation, and so dim in its knowledge is the image of one who was deemed by so shrewd a judge as Lord Cockburn to be the greatest Scottish clergyman since the Reformation and greater as a churchman than Knox himself, and of whom Carlyle said that he believed 'there will never again be such a preacher in any Christian Church.'

Professor Watt, in this admirable book, has his eye more on the Disruption than on Chalmers, but the image of that great man does appear with sufficient clearness to show us the secret of the impression he made on his generation. It is surprising, or it would be if we did not know similar cases, how dull discourses appear to us which once electrified audiences. Nearly everything that Chalmers said or wrote or even thought has been published, but it is not only not read to-day, it is nearly unreadable. The secret of its tremendous attraction lay in the personality behind it. Chalmers had only to appear in any pulpit or on any platform to draw huge crowds. This was so unwelcome to him that on one occasion he intimated in the morning that he would preach the same sermon again in the evening. It did not matter. The crowd was there again, to hear, not the discourse but the man. Lord Cockburn tells a curious story of one of Chalmers' great speeches in the Assembly. As soon as he finished, so deep was the impression made that somebody moved a vote of thanks to him. But another member moved that they should first return thanks to God. The Moderator ended the discussion by putting the question whether they should return thanks to Dr. Chalmers, or by prayer to God. 'The Moderator declared that Dr. Chalmers had it, and proceeded to eulogise him accordingly' (*Journal*, i. 97). Lord Jeffrey's judgment, quoted by Professor Watt, is worth repeating: 'Never had eloquence produced a greater effect upon a popular assembly . . . and he could not believe more had ever been done by the oratory of Demosthenes, Cicero, Burke, or Sheridan.'

This effect does not seem to have been created by the physical qualities of the orator. Dr. Watt includes in his volume two silhouettes by a French artist and one would imagine from them that Chalmers was an elegant and handsome person, but this is not consistent with the picture Cockburn (who knew him intimately) gives of him: 'Everybody loved the quaint, picturesque oddity of his look, figure, and manner; his self-coined diction and thick articulation; his taste for cumbrous jokes, and the merry twinkle of the eye.' The power exercised by Chalmers was due to character and the intensity of his religious faith as well as the force and quality of his mind. He was utterly unworldly, indifferent to praise or blame, free entirely from pride, almost unconscious of his own great gifts, and filled with a passionate devotion to his Master and a burning zeal for the extension of the Kingdom of God. It was this possession by the Spirit of Christ that swept out to his hearers and moved them to devotion and sacrifice. Wherever he went there was at once set agoing a movement of the spirit awakening men and women to their need of a Saviour.

The greatest work of Chalmers was, of course, the Free Church. One can hardly say it was his work, indeed. Some one (I forget who) has said that if none of the Ministers had 'come out' the people would have done so. But, at any rate, he was the predestined instrument. And the story of that long struggle which preceded the Disruption of 1843 is told in this book with extraordinary skill. I question if it has ever been told more clearly or forcibly. Professor Watt has mastered the whole of the relevant literature, and that is saying a great deal. But he might easily have been lost in that mass of controversy and debate, of ecclesiastical intrigue and judicial ineptitudes. He moves forward with a sure foot amidst it all, and presents a picture we can all look at with understanding. This is a really fine book. The ability of the author controls his material with admirable discipline, and he is not only informative and discerning but always interesting.

I am afraid that a story like this has the effect of lessening one's respect for the judicial bench. Judges are generally good men, sincere and capable but even they are not above the distorting influence of political bias or social prejudice. We saw that in the notorious judgment that created the present Free Church. There was at the time of the Disruption a widespread conviction among fair-minded men that the Court of Session was not impartial and this was one of the influences that helped the cause of the Free Church of 1843 in Scotland. But whether that be so or no it is clear to us to-day, and Dr. Watt has brought this out with admirable clarity, that there was at stake a great principle and one that had been the crucial question in every great national conflict. 'Scotland for Christ through a Church free from civil domination in the ordering of its own spiritual affairs under Him sums up the witness of four centuries.' That is how Dr. Watt puts it, and it cannot be better said. This was the passionate aim of Chalmers' life, and he longed to see it realised so that Christ's Kirk would be brought to every door in the land.

F. J. Rae.

DR. TEMPLE'S BOOK FOR LENT.

That the Archbishop of Canterbury should have commissioned the Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford, to write his Lent book, is a striking proof not only of Dr. Temple's breadth of mind but also of the agreement between the Church of England and Orthodox Dissent in respect of the articles of the Christian Faith. The book is called *The Doctrine of Our Redemption* (Eyre & Spottiswoode; 4s. 6d. net). It is not, as the title might suggest, another student's text-book on the Atonement, but a series of studies—rather unsystematic but broadly chronological—on the idea of Redemption in Christian theology all down the ages: 'the Good News declared in Scripture, taught in the life of the Church and felt in the personal experience of mankind.'

Dr. Temple writes the Introduction, and there follow nine chapters and an epilogue. Each chapter is prefaced with a list of books for further reading and a questionnaire.

Of course the book is charmingly written (*le style c'est l'homme*); the approach is impeccably orthodox; and the whole is adorned with felicitous excerpts from the doctors and saints of the Great Church, as P. T. Forsyth would say. The Greeks had a saying about 'worshipping the divine with other people's incense.' Dr. Micklem has done that.

Coming down to detail, I liked especially the first chapter ('What is Redemption?') and chapter two, which is an expansion of the old dictum: *Novum Testamentum in vetere latet, Vetus Testamentum in novo patet*, along the lines, new but old, so freshly traced in Hebert's book, 'The Throne of David.' Chapter three treats of the New Testament Fulfilment: a fresh and scholarly exposition which, because it does not seek to show the essential unity of the New Testament, appears rather scrappy and atomistic. Chapters four and five, which discuss the theology of the Eastern Church, view the Redemption as wrought by the Incarnation of the Son of God whereby human nature is taken up into the divine nature; and there is an exposition of Aulén's theory of the Atonement. Chapters six and seven bring us to Augustine—and firmer ground; for Augustine takes us back to the 'Jesus of History' and 'interprets our salvation as a coming home to God through Jesus Christ who is to us the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Christ weans us from the love of the world to the love of God which is the true end of man.' Chapter eight gives us 'divers delectable draughts' from the writings of the mediæval doctors—Abélard, Anselm, Aquinas, Duns Scotus—on Redemption. The final chapter shows us the views of the Reformers, and of Luther and Bunyan.

The book admirably serves its purpose—to 'quicken thoughtful devotion and devotional thought.' While (*pace* Dr. Micklem) we gravely doubt whether much of the patristic and mediæval theology has an appeal—or relevance—to the world in which we are now living, the merit of the book is that it provides a fascinating conspectus of Christian thought down the centuries concerning Redemption. If we add that there are excellent brief discussions (*e.g.* on 'Grace,' p. 7 f.) and some bits of really superb writing (*vide*, p. 11), it will be evident that the book will deepen and enrich the faith of those who live already within the circle of Catholic Christianity.

A. M. HUNTER.

SCIENCE, RELIGION, AND SOCIALISM.

Mr. Joseph Needham, Sc.D., F.R.S., has an evident partiality for quaint titles which give no indication of the contents of the book. Already we have had 'The Great Amphibium,' and now from his pen comes *Time: The Refreshing River* (Allen & Unwin; 16s. net). It is a remarkably small book for the price, but it is closely printed and contains a large amount of material of the highest quality. It consists of a collection of about a dozen essays and addresses which have appeared in the last decade. They deal with a wide variety of topics, including a Biologist's View of Whitehead's Philosophy and, somewhat surprisingly, a Reappraisement of Henry Drummond. But there is a real unity in the book, and its subject may be described as the relations between Science, Religion, and Socialism. The introductory essay, 'Metamorphoses of Scepticism,' which is to a large extent autobiographical, tells how the writer, 'a prowler among ideas' in many fields, was for long 'sceptical of the construction of any coherent world-view which would reconcile the conflicting claims of the forms of experience together.' But now through a new interest in ethics and politics he has found a satisfying synthesis of thought in the dialectical materialism of Communism. The vindication of this position runs through all the book, and it is no half-hearted one. Of the present social system nothing good can be said. Under it 'honesty has been an almost impossible virtue,' 'charity has become a word of abuse, implying the erratic bounty of wealthy robbers towards the poor and simple-hearted,' 'regard for truth is confined to a few scientists and philosophers.' Like others of the intelligentsia who take up the Communist position Dr. Needham idealizes the proletariat. 'The people are *never* wrong,' Communists 'hold this doctrine of love to our comrade in a more thoroughgoing and enlightened manner than it has ever been held before.' How completely the scientist is hidden under the cloak of the partisan! The Communist doubtless has a strong sense of comradeship, but for opponents short shrift at the nearest lamp post. But Dr. Needham would regard such procedure with equanimity, for he looks on revolution and civil war as inevitable and concurs with Lenin's aphorism that 'crowns must be cracked' to pave the way for the dictatorship of the proletariat and beyond that the classless age. And this he is pleased to call the coming of the Kingdom of God. Strange that when God Himself has been dismissed from the scene the concept of His Kingdom should be retained! In an interesting chapter on Evolution and Thermo-

dynamics he discusses the contradiction between the physicist's picture of a universe which is running down and the biologist's theory of evolution. It cannot be denied that the upward movement is sectional and is embraced in the vaster sweep of the downward movement, so that the situation, in Sir James Jeans' phrase, is like that of a sailor climbing the mast of a sinking ship. But Dr. Needham comforts himself by the reflection that the final catastrophe is far distant, leaving ample room for the advent of the classless society in some future age. It is a materialistic optimism haunted and overshadowed by a more dreadful pessimism. We have found much to criticise in the book, but it is thought-provoking in the highest degree, for this accomplished 'prowler among ideas' never comes home empty-handed from any field. J. H. MORRISON.

The Token of Our Inheritance, by the Rev. Leslie E. Cooke, B.A., B.D. (Independent Press; 3s. 6d. net), contains 'Meditations on the Witness of the Holy Spirit.' The author tells us that this is a book which *had* to be written, because it is the expression of an inner necessity that has been laid on him. Its publication is due to a request from the Literature Committee of the Congregational Union that he should provide the Lenten publication for 1943. On both grounds the book is entitled to our respect, and the contents will not diminish this respect. The writer protests that it is not theology, or preaching, or devotion, but readers will incline to think it is all three. At any rate there is here an intelligent and devout discussion of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in both its intellectual and devotional aspects, that is, as a doctrine and an experience. The chapters are always interesting. There is a wealth of literary and historical illustration, and the book will satisfy both the mind and the heart.

Mr. Douglas Edwards, of the Community of the Resurrection, has published *The Virgin Birth in History and Faith* (Faber & Faber; 12s. 6d. net). It is a vigorous defence of this traditional Christian doctrine. The author is well acquainted with the critical writers on the subject, both liberal and conservative, and he handles the liberal critics—in particular Dr. Vincent Taylor—with great ability and acumen; but his vigour betrays him into a great deal of sweeping condemnatory assertion that is hardly justifiable. His opponents seem to be classed as literary and doctrinaire critics, and he himself is an historical critic. He is convinced on the evidence of history that the Virgin Birth of Jesus is deeply rooted in the apostolic tradition, but those who do not share this conviction have little or no conception of what historical evidence means, indeed have a fundamental ineptitude for history. At this time of day this will not do. After all, even if it be allowed to the author that he has made out a pretty strong case for his fundamental contention (based, let it be said, on a close examination of the Biblical and other writings of the Apostolic Church), that the Virgin Birth belongs to apostolic faith and is not an evangelistic invention from Jewish or Pagan sources, it does not follow that it must be accepted by all who would call themselves Christian. In his own Anglican communion the right of liberal opinion on this subject is recognized. We add that Mr. Edwards' work may be taken as, in the proportions of its treatment, complementary to the recent works on the same subject of J. Gresham Machen and others.

In *Modern Discovery and the Bible*, by Mr. A. Rendle Short, M.D., B.Sc., F.R.C.S., Professor of Surgery in the University of Bristol (Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions; 5s. net), the author deals with the idea which has 'got abroad' that men of learning, and especially scientists, have discovered facts which make the Bible impossible of belief for any one with a modern education. He begins by producing evidence that many of the most eminent scientists have themselves been professing Christians. Then he tests the idea that religion began with a belief in ghosts and has had a natural evolution. A long chapter is devoted to the question of purpose in creation (a very good discussion). The cosmogony in the first chapter of Genesis is vindicated. The treatment of the 'days' is a serious blot on an intelligent defence of the Bible. The chapter on man's origin will be received with a good deal of sympathy from open-minded readers who distrust a good deal of the speculative reconstruction of man's history. The remainder of the book deals with archæological discovery and the Bible, and the literary problem of the Pentateuch. The book is a valuable one for its presentation of facts. At certain points it tends to obscurantism, but on the whole it is both able and candid, and will have a reassuring influence on those who read it.

The author of *Wisdom Builds a City* (Mowbray; 2s. 6d. net) prefers to be anonymous and to be known only as the author of 'The Chronicles of Brother Wolf.' The present booklet contains a series of devotional studies based upon the names of the precious stones which are the foundations of St. John's Holy City. Each precious stone is taken as emblematic of some Christian grace or virtue, *e.g.* truth, purity, love, etc. It is a booklet to be taken up in a quiet hour and should prove an aid to devotion. It is mentioned that the royalties on the book will be given to the rebuilding fund of Exeter Cathedral.

Most people have read the Pope's 'Five Points,' the Christian basis, as he conceived it, of a just peace. The same people will remember, at least vaguely, the letter to *The Times* in which the writers, accepting the Pope's points, added Five Standards, by which 'economic situations and proposals may be tested.' Both contributions to post-war reconstruction were widely discussed at the time and have been expanded by other movements, like 'Malvern.' And now a well-known writer, the Rev. Frank H. Ballard, M.A.,

has looked at them from the Christian standpoint in *The Churches Face the Challenge* (Nisbet; 2s. 6d. net). He brings all the proposals up to the test of the New Testament, and has no difficulty in showing that they have a Christian sanction. His chapters are headed thus: Wealth and Possessions, Equal Opportunities of Education, Recent Attacks on the Family, The Waning Sense of Vocation, The Earth is the Lord's. It is all very sensible and good. Incidentally, Mr. Ballard gives the Five Points and the Five Standards verbatim.

My Parish Church, by Mr. Basil F. L. Clarke (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net), is a small introductory study of old churches written for those who have little or no knowledge of the subject. It covers church architecture from Celtic times to our own day, the book being equally divided between the pre- and post-Reformation periods. It is attractively and lucidly written, and is profusely illustrated. Dull, indeed, will he be who cannot glean essential knowledge from this little volume. Too often church architecture is presented as a mere technical study, and writers make heavy weather of their subject—'dismal entertainment'—but here, all that is changed. The angle of approach is fresh and unconventional. Carried in the pocket the volume will prove a safe and companionable guide to the ecclesiastical treasure houses of Britain.

The Godfrey Day Memorial Lectures in Trinity College, Dublin, for 1942, were delivered by Canon Geoffrey Allen, who took for his subject, *The Theology of Missions* (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net). The three lectures deal with the Missionary Motive, the Missionary Approach, and the Missionary Method. They are simple straightforward talks full of Christian common sense. The lecturer, as was natural, draws from his experience as a missionary in China a wealth of illustrative matter which makes the lectures most informative and interesting to read.

The Disruption.

By the Reverend Professor W. D. Niven, D.D., Glasgow.

Exactly one hundred years ago, on May 18, 1843, took place one of the most dramatic events in Scottish History. Dr. Welsh, Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, left the place of Assembly and, followed by a large number of members of Assembly, walked through packed streets to Tanfield Hall, where he and his followers solemnly declared themselves to be the Supreme Court of the Church, demitted their stipends, churches, and manses, and sent a message to that effect back to the Assembly which they had left. So came into existence the Free Church of Scotland.

To tell the whole story would take a volume. Here one must attempt no more than tell enough to make the incident intelligible.

I.

As the eighteenth century was nearing its end, a great change passed over Scotland and all western Europe. It was one of the periods of reawakening of the human spirit. We are here concerned only with religion. In the eighteenth century the Church of Scotland was more or less a battleground between 'Moderates' and so-called 'Evangelicals.' The latter were doubtfully worthy of the name. They certainly did not, like their opponents, read to their congregations moral essays such as a pagan philosopher might have declaimed; but they were arid, doctrinaire exponents of Calvinism and the future destiny of the sinner.

As the nineteenth century advanced better things prevailed in the Church of Scotland. A new, warm evangelism came into being. It was fittingly dressed in all the refinements of form and diction which the 'Moderates' had the credit of introducing to the Scottish pulpit. It proclaimed a winsome gospel in a winsome way, and the empty churches filled up. Among the people a new spirit was awake, a new sense of their rights, and the dignity of the 'common' man. Burns had expressed it unforgettably in 'A man's a man for a' that.' The French Revolution, both in its fair beginnings and its appalling 'terror,' made a deep impression in Scotland. The new evangelical party were concerned on the one hand to give the people their rights in the Church, and at the same time safeguard the country from a like popular madness as had afflicted France. They said then what we say now—the real safeguard is religion; and if the Church is to save the people she must put her own house in order.

II.

As to one point there was no difference of opinion. It was obvious to everybody that the old provision of one church per parish all over Scotland could not possibly suit the changing distribution of population. The process of concentration in large

towns had not by 1830 attained the gigantic proportions it had reached by the end of the century; but the process was beginning, considerable movement was going on, and as the industrial revolution developed, the pace was accelerated. It was obvious that Church Extention must take place if the population was to be effectively reached. Government was approached, made a vague promise of a grant totally inadequate, and in the end did nothing. By the efforts of the Church unaided, Chapels-of-Ease were provided where the need was greatest.

Agreement ceased, however, when the question was raised as to the status and ecclesiastical rights of the Ministers and Sessions of those extension charges. Have the Ministers the right to a seat in the Presbytery and other Courts? Have the Sessions the right to be represented in these Courts? If these questions were to be answered in the negative, it was plain that a curious situation would soon emerge. Some of those chapels were bound sooner or later to outweigh in importance —however estimated—some of the old Parish congregations; and they would be served by Ministers of inferior status, and have no voice in Church Courts. That seemed unfair in itself, and what appeal would this make to the people? As to that there was probably little difference of opinion. The difference emerged as to the policy to be pursued. Was the Church simply to proceed to admit the Chapel-Ministers to full ecclesiastical status without asking the sanction of Parliament? Or had an Enabling Act first to be obtained? The former was the view of the Moncrieff party, the latter that of the opponents.

III.

The problem as to Chapel-Ministers, undoubtedly important in itself, was scarcely fitted to rouse widespread feeling among the people not directly concerned. The burning question in which every Parish was concerned, was the right of the people to have a real measure of privilege and responsibility in the election of their Ministers. Since 1711 they had had none. They still, indeed, signed a 'Call,' but the 'Call' was a mere formality. Since 1711, when Parliament without consulting or even informing the Church, rushed through with suspicious haste the necessary Bill, which was an Act before the amazed and outraged Church could make any effective protest, a vacant Parish was 'presented' with a Minister chosen by the Patron. The Presbytery thereupon had to take him on 'trial' for ordination or induction. If no objection to his 'literature, life, or doctrine' could be substantiated he was forthwith installed as Minister of the Parish. It is not to be denied that in many cases Patronage gave Parishes thoroughly good Ministers. Chalmers and all the Parish Ministers who 'went out' in 1843 had been 'presented' to their Parishes. But it is equally indisputable that for a hundred years before the Disruption Patronage had caused a running sore in the Church. Every other year Secessions had taken place, and while Patronage was by no means the only cause of them, it was undoubtedly a main cause. The Moderates, at first perturbed by Secession, had come to take a curiously complacent attitude towards it. About the end of the eighteenth century one Moderate actually found Scotland with the Church of Scotland surrounded by the varied groups of Seceders comparable to a beautifully variegated flower-garden. It was the contention of Chalmers that the Call must be made a real factor in filling a vacancy. How under Patronage could this be done? By inserting a fourth condition, Chalmers thought, on which Presbyteries would ordain or induct, namely the acceptability of the presentee to the people of the Parish, ascertained by the presence or lack of a protest against his appointment, made by a majority of heads of families, on the ground that the presentee was unacceptable. This proposal, we may agree, was not very satisfactory. When the Church case came before the Court of Session we can understand the scorn poured upon it. Why heads of families? Why exclude women? By what criterion could the substantiality or triviality of objections be assessed? Dr. Chalmers, however, was persuaded that by this power of 'veto' granted to a majority of heads of families, the worst mischief of Patronage might be overcome. From the first he saw clearly and definitely acknowledged that the Patron might insist on 'presenting' his nominee to the stipend and other temporal benefits. But he thought an unacceptable presentee could be debarred by sentence of the Church Court from the exercise of all spiritual functions within the Parish, and that the State or the Law Courts would not, because they could not, intervene. So in 1834 the General Assembly passed by substantial majorities two Acts, the Chapels Act which gave the Chapel-Ministers equal rights and privileges with the Parish Ministers, and the Veto Act which, as explained above, gave certain parishioners the right to refuse to be put under an unacceptable presentee. Against both Acts there voted a considerable minority.

It is puzzling that the bold, straightforward course was not taken of agitating for a repeal by Parliament of the Patronage Act of 1711. One sees the difficulty of merely repealing that Act which would have restored the quite unsatisfactory method of filling vacancies sanctioned at

the Revolution Settlement. That was not adequate. It gave the right of election and presentation to the heritors who might be comparatively numerous or very few, not inconceivably just an atheist, a Roman Catholic, a Jew, and an Episcopalian, not one of them a member of the Church of Scotland. That, of course, is an imaginary case which no Parish exhibited. But even at the best it was scarcely worth while to agitate for the substitution of a Committee of Patrons for one Patron. To Patronage there was only one alternative—popular election; and at this stage Chalmers had no belief in popular election. He feared that it would be putting power in the hands of the 'ungodly multitude,' which to him was as bad as Patronage.

IV.

Meanwhile, outside the Church an agitation had been started which set Scotland ablaze. There appeared the 'Voluntaries' who, making a principle of their experience, launched a strong attack on Church Establishment. They held that the State had no business to 'establish' a Church; that the Church ought in no circumstances to accept State establishment, endowment, or any other favour; and that establishment involved a curtailment of the Church's spiritual liberty. The civil magistrate, they maintained, had only one duty towards the Church, and that was to abstain from doing anything. Widespread interest was aroused; the controversy raged in Press, Pulpit, and Public Meeting. The utility of Church-establishment, its practical benefits and its necessity if the Church were to serve the nation adequately, were urged in no more eloquent and persuasive language than that of Dr. Chalmers. 'Establishment' had no more doughty champion than he. In the cause he gave a series of lectures in London which provided Londoners with a sensation. Crowds flocked to hear him lecture on the Church of Scotland. He drew a glowing picture of the happy state of that Church as by law established. The advantages of being established were many and invaluable. As to disadvantages, he was aware of none. No surrender or curtailment of spiritual independence was involved. Establishment did not diminish the liberties of the Church, it safeguarded them.

The lectures must be considered singularly unfortunate. The 'Voluntaries' poured scorn on them. Had they known modern slang they would have said that Chalmers was 'talking through his hat.' It must be admitted that Chalmers spoke with quite unwarranted confidence, seeing that before the lectures the series of Law-cases as to the legal validity of the Acts of 1834 had already begun. It is always distressing to find that a trusted leader has totally misread a situation as subsequent events demonstrate.

The importance of the voluntary controversy lies here—it drove Chalmers to declare that if the disadvantages of establishment depicted by the 'Voluntaries' could be proved to be real, he would not stay in a Church so fettered.

V.

The briefest summary of the events of the years 1834–43 must suffice. Presentees rejected under the Veto Act, or disciplined by a Presbytery which included Chapel-Ministers, appealed to the Court of Session. In case after case the Supreme Law Court, backed in one test-case by the House of Lords, declared that the two Acts of Assembly of 1834 were null and void, that the Church in passing them had acted *ultra vires*, and must in taking presentees on trial consider no more than their 'literature,' orthodoxy and character, and that only Parish Ministers could share in this examination. Chalmers held that the Church, as had been maintained by Knox, Melville, and Alexander Henderson, had 'from Christ' an inherent authority and jurisdiction, recognized but not given by the State. The Law Courts denied this: whatever liberty the Church had, had been conferred on her by the State, and while the Law Courts would protect the Church in the free exercise of the rights the State had granted, they would punish the Church if she dared to exercise more liberty than the State had definitely and explicitly allowed. On that view of the Church's 'establishment' the Court of Session proceeded to act with vigour and rigour. They ordered Presbyteries to induct presentees to Parishes. They summoned a recalcitrant Presbytery before them, sternly rebuked it and threatened severe penalties on the individual members were their offence repeated. The General Assembly deposed seven ministers in Strathbogie for contumacy; the Court of Session ignored the sentence, and interdicted all other Ministers from entering their Parishes without their consent. It was a grotesque and intolerable situation.

It is important for understanding of the Free Church view to observe that Chalmers and his followers perceived that the decisions of the Law Courts touched something far deeper than the mere questions of Intrusion and Chapel-Ministers. Their decisions and their explanations in justification of their decisions, revealed that in the view of the supreme and final interpreters of the Law, the Church possessed no liberty which the State had not granted. Chalmers' glorious picture of the Church of Scotland in her complete freedom within her own sphere was dreadfully commented on by the Court of Session; and

the contentions of the 'Voluntaries' seemed proved.

Remedy was sought, the Veto Act suspended meanwhile. Appeal was made to both political parties for legislation to ease the situation. The Crown was addressed personally. There were hopes of a satisfactory measure sponsored by Lord Aberdeen. But when the Bill appeared in 1840 it was found to be quite inadequate and bore little resemblance to what his Lordship had been understood to promise. By 1842 all hope of legislative remedy was lost, and arrangements were discussed for the leaving of the Church as by law established, and the inauguration of a nation-wide Free Church of Scotland. There was regrettably nothing else to be done. Renunciation by Chalmers of all he had contended for, and to which he had attached such importance, was unthinkable, not only in the mind of Chalmers but in the mind of every serious person in Scotland.

VI.

The Disruption—by which Chalmers meant disruption not of the Church, but of the bonds which the Court of Session had declared bound the Church—stirred Scotland, and many far beyond it. It called forth tributes of admiration from many notable personages. There is something which at once inspires and rebukes in the spectacle of men making a great sacrifice for conscience' sake. It *was* a great sacrifice, though the hardships of all were not equal. All had to leave stipend and manse. Some were to be homeless for months. Some had to be content with a couple of small rooms in a farmhouse. Some had to break up their families, and live where they could in separation. Some had dark visions of having to emigrate. But all marched with head erect to Tanfield. Gladstone wrote of how a Roman Catholic friend of his took new heart of hope for religion from their courage and sacrifice for conscience' sake, and

> Even the ranks of Tuscany
> Could scarce forbear to cheer.

A formidable task lay ahead. Churches and manses and schools had to be built. New buildings for the overseas Missions had to be provided. A theological college had to be instituted. An adequate stipend had to be secured. The prospect was dark to many. It was lightened when, in Tanfield, Chalmers announced to an almost incredulous Assembly that gifts had been pouring in and promises of financial support made, and that already the Free Church of Scotland had some £223,000 to its credit. The Disruption was not an impulsive event, it was well organized, and financial and other preparations had been carefully made.

Chalmers made plain what the Free Church of Scotland stood for. It stood for two things—the spiritual freedom of the Church and the national recognition of religion. He and his followers left 'a vitiated establishment' in hope of returning to a pure one. Emphatically he declared 'we are not voluntaries.' He instituted not the Free-Church of Scotland, but the Free Church-of-Scotland. As the years passed this tended to be obscured and even forgotten. With that we are not here concerned.

VII.

Now that the unhappy days of division are over, it would be ungracious to dismiss the Disruption without paying a tribute to what the Free Church of Scotland termed 'the Residuary Establishment.' If the prospects for those who left in 1843 were uncertain, the task formidable, and the achievement marvellous, all that was likewise true for them who remained. The Church of Scotland lost heavily in ministers, elders, and members. And among those who left were many whose places in the counsels and services of the Church could not be easily filled. Then, all the overseas missionaries left; so did a very great number of the Probationers and a majority of the theological students. Then, by 1843 the Church of Scotland was dependent for the prosecution of much of its work on the contributions of its membership; and among those who left were many of the most liberal givers. It was not exactly an exhilarating prospect. The recovery of the Church of Scotland, and the rapidity of it, command our admiration. Her vacant Parishes were soon filled, her overseas stations re-staffed. Her 'Christian liberality' rose to meet the requirements of an increasingly heavy undertaking. As this month we pay tribute to Chalmers, we revere no less the memory of Norman Macleod. Both sincerely desired 'the Christian good of Scotland,' both worked for it, and by different paths they both contributed mightily towards it. Nor must we forget that it was the Church of Scotland that took the initiative in the negotiations which so happily ended in re-union, and at no point did she ask or even suggest that the Free Church principle of spiritual independence should be compromised. She only made it clear, and it needed to be made clear to some, that it was of importance to maintain the 'national recognition of religion.' That was clear to Chalmers too. It was, as we have seen, an original Free Church 'principle.' Could the two principles, which the Law Courts in 1843 had shown to be incompatible as the law then stood, be reconciled? Could the Church of Scotland remain recognizably 'established' and become

indubitably 'free'? It turned out that it could, provided Parliament passed legislation unambiguously recognizing the claim which the Church, or a considerable section of the Church, had been urging since the Reformation. Parliament agreed; and the Church of Scotland to-day is the Church described by Chalmers in his London lectures. It would be a prejudiced judgment to say that the Re-union of 1929 was a victory for the Free Church. The history of the last hundred years shows that both sides were vindicated. It turned out to be for the 'Christian good of Scotland' that the separation took place. It was with a view to the 'Christian good of Scotland' that re-union was consummated. God grant that that aim be realized!

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

'Too good to be used.'

By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Lisbon.

I wonder how many drawers and cupboards have things in them that were made and meant to be used, and have never been used, because they were 'too good to be used.'

They are never things you have bought but always things you have been given: perhaps a handsomely bound copy of a book which some one knew was one of your favourites and sent you on your birthday. Because it was so finely bound you put it in a bookcase with glass doors, and there it remained, untouched, unread, because it was too good to be handled. But the friend who gave it meant it to be used as a book should be used, and that is read. A book is not an ornament; it's a book, and a book that isn't read might as well never have been printed.

Mayhap it is a patiently worked and finely wrought tablecloth, a present to your mother, a beautiful thing. But it is too good to be used. It is folded up carefully and put away in tissue-paper, and brought out sometimes to be shown and admired; but never to be put to its proper use. 'Of course it's much too good to be used. Somebody might spill something on it. It might be stained. All sorts of things might happen to it. It's much too good to be used.' So it isn't used. And so it is no use at all: for what isn't used is no use.

It is all very well to treasure the gifts of a friend, but surely the best way of showing appreciation is to put a gift to its proper use. The master in the Parable gave talents to his servants to be used, and the one he was angry with was the one who wrapped his talent in a napkin and never used it. Perhaps he thought it was too good to be used!

The worst of it is that sometimes, when the thing so carefully treasured is brought out, it is found to have deteriorated: its colours have faded, moths have got at it and done it mischief. It might have fared better had it been used; it couldn't have fared worse. I have heard and told elsewhere of a minister who had a fine silk umbrella presented to him by a grateful couple whom he had married. It was so beautifully folded that he couldn't bring himself to open it, for he knew he could never do it up so neatly; so he only took it out on fine days. One day he was caught in a shower and had to open it and put it up; and when he did, he found that the silk had cut along the folds and it was no use whatever as an umbrella. It wasn't meant to be used as a walking-stick, or to be an ornament in the umbrella-stand, but to be used as an umbrella to keep the rain off. So what wasn't used, in the end wasn't usable.

These things after all are merely silly, and not serious; but it is serious if we treat God's gifts that way.

God gave the Jews a great gift, the knowledge of Himself, a knowledge which no other people had. That was meant to be used. It was for the world. Israel was to be 'a light to lighten the nations.' But the Jewish people wouldn't look at it that way. They kept their religion to themselves: it was too fine a thing to be given to other nations. And so the religion they kept, as it were, in cold storage, went bad, and when Christ came they killed Him to keep their religion safe.

In times past, anxious folk thought the only way to save their souls was to get away from the world of men into hermitages and convents. Their souls were much too precious to risk being soiled by contact with the world and its temptations. History tells us what happened and it is a sad story. It proved the truth of Jesus' words when He said 'whosoever will save his life shall lose it.' In some things it is better to spend than to save.

We, as a Christian nation, have received the great gift of the gospel of Jesus Christ. It is meant to be used every day, and not just brought out on Sundays to be admired and then put away for the rest of the week. It's to be used in the dust of every day. It is to be shared and sent out to the world.

God has given you each gifts, 'talents,' not just to make your life easy and happy, but that you may make the lives of others easier and happier. What are you doing with them? Using them as He means them to be used? or saving them—losing them?

Signposts.

By the Reverend T. E. Edmond, M.A.,
Vicar of Little Heath, Herts.

'This is the way, walk ye in it.'—Is 30^{21}.

The signpost is back again! Yes, at my gate, right in the church grounds, there it is, the same old signpost, 'To Brookman's Park Stn'! I thought there was something astir the first morning I went out of my front door the day after they put it back. And then I saw it, a little stained and dirty, but still the same old sign. It meant the fear of invasion was over. That was the Government's way of telling us.

Oh, how I had missed the old signpost after they had taken it away! They just pulled it out by its roots, and left the hole where it had been. I suppose they were in a hurry, in case the enemy came, and used the signposts to find his way about. But the Great North Road seemed so lonely without its signposts. But now my post is back again! What a joy! Like so many other things in life, it had never seemed so useful, as when it had been removed. How many cars had stopped outside my house, and asked the way as soon as they took the sign away! Nobody seemed able to locate the district without the old post. I never realized how many cars, cycles, and pedestrians had gone confidently down that road. And it was all because of the signpost!

Yes, signposts are important. They point the way. They prevent you going astray. We need them on the road of life, as we need them on the roads and lanes of our beloved country. It's so easy to get lost. Our Lord knew that. He was very worried about the 'lost.' He told some wonderful stories about the lost sheep, the lost coin, and the lost son. He is always happy when the lost are found. It's so easy to get lost, and so hard to find the way again, unless there are signs to help you. David Livingstone knew what it was like to get lost in the heart of a great continent. Did you listen-in to a great American airman telling his story of his thrilling adventures when his plane came down in the Pacific, and he and his companions were lost for days? Or, perhaps you have heard an aeroplane at night flying, as it seemed, backward and forward over your house, and you realized that the pilot had lost his way. He couldn't find anything he recognized to guide him home.

And then, too, it's so lonely when you don't know the way. I think a signpost is a very friendly thing. Francis Thompson, the great poet, who saw

> the traffic of Jacob's ladder
> Pitched betwixt Heaven and Charing Cross,

once said that he knew how lonely you could be in the midst of a crowded London street. But, if you are on the right road, you find there are others there too. The world is very friendly after all. It's good to be alive.

A signpost gives you a sense of direction, which is so important to a happy life. So many people simply don't know where they are going. They lose confidence in themselves, become petty and trivial, bad tempered and sullen, because they don't know the meaning of life, and what it all leads to. A great scholar once said that life is divided into 'those who say how much can I take out of life, and those who say how much can I put into life?' That is all the difference between those who have a purpose in life and those who haven't. Scratched on the pavement of an old Roman city in Algeria, which I expect our soldiers have visited, are the words, 'To hunt, to bathe, to gamble, and to laugh, that is to live.' Well, that was how someone long ago saw a purpose in life, but it isn't good enough! You must be on the right road to have a worthy aim in life. You must know where the road leads to. And that's exactly what the signpost tells you!

Let us always be grateful that our Heavenly Father has put so many signs on the road to guide us. Right at the beginning of the road there is our conscience giving us the general direction always to choose the right road. Then there are 'all things bright and beautiful, all things wise and wonderful,' set to guide us to choose the right, forsake the wrong, and believe the truth. But best of all there is our church. Its services and sacraments, its ministry and message, are all signs directing us to the right road to God. We call them 'means of grace.' Let us watch for the signposts on the road, and always obey their directions, for they are all saying, 'this is the way, walk ye in it.'

And still more, we can't go wrong on our journey through life to God, who is our Home, if we walk in the right way. Jesus said, 'I am the way . . . no man cometh unto the Father but by me.' Nobody has ever gone astray who has faithfully followed Him.

> Thou art the Way: to Thee alone
> From sin and death we flee;
> And he who would the Father seek
> Must seek Him, Lord, by Thee.

The Christian Year.

Third Sunday after Easter.

The Discipline of Loneliness.

By the Reverend Canon A. C. Deane, M.A.,
The Cloisters, Windsor Castle.

'Ye shall leave me alone.'—Jn 16^{32}.

Sad the Master was when He said these words; sad because those loud-protested vows of loyalty were to prove of no worth; sad because the bodily pains He must endure would be heightened by the pang of isolation, and no friendly face, no look of sympathy would He find when the hireling mob in the Praetorium howled for His destruction. Always the nearness of friends had counted for much with Him. Whether His experience was to be the glory of the Transfiguration or the agony in the garden, He would have beside Him those three whom, even among the

Twelve, He held most dear. Yet in their company came moments when He stood apart, when those upon whom He had lavished a wealth of teaching remained in thought obtusely remote from their Teacher. 'Are ye also yet without understanding?' He asked Peter, and again, not much later: 'Do ye not yet understand?' The two sentences are in consecutive chapters of the Matthaean Gospel, and how often our Lord must have turned to His disciples with some such words of disappointment! Yet stronger at times must have been the sense of isolation when He spoke to the multitude, when He and the listeners seemed at cross-purposes, when the patient exposition and vivid parables failed to show them the meaning of His words, so that 'life' or 'righteousness' or 'the Kingdom of God' still kept one sense for Him, another for His hearers.

Times of compensating happiness came also, as when Peter knew Him for the Divine Christ, when John showed his profound spiritual perceptiveness, when Mary of Bethany sat at His feet. Yet to read the Gospels with care is to grow sure that a feeling of spiritual and mental loneliness was a trial which afflicted our Lord through the years of His ministry. True, its beginnings in Galilee, before orders from Jerusalem had closed the synagogues to Him, seemed rich in promise. Crowds listened to this new teaching because it was new; larger crowds brought sick folk for healing or were eager to witness miracles; popular applause reached its height and tried to crown Him when He satisfied bodily hunger. But to Him every such success seemed another disappointment, a frustration of His aim. He planned to transform human life by transformed human lives, lives in which to do God's will would be the sole motive and love the supreme law. This could not come to pass unless His teaching were understood. He craved understanding companionship; yet, for the most part, He had to remain solitary in thought and ideal. There were times, we may reverently believe, when He would have found immense solace had He been able to speak of those deeper truths, which the disciples were 'unable to bear'; to discuss means of accomplishing His mission with friends of high spiritual perceptiveness, and how rarely can this boon have been His!

Physical solitude was for Him, until those last hours, something to be gained at any cost, for His work could not be done without the strength and refreshment it gave. He must be alone for prayer and communion with the Father, for consecrating Himself and the day's toil, for shaping, perhaps, those matchless parables into their perfect form. The records show how resolutely He sought these times of solitude, how often He would be defeated by the crowd which discovered Him where He had hoped to be alone, or with none but the disciples; how, again, after hours of exhausting work He would rise 'a great while before day' for solitary prayer on that hillside where He could be sure of unmolested quiet. 'When thou prayest, enter into thine inner chamber, and having shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret' was counsel He gave, not, perhaps, without a thought of envy, for seldom indeed in those last years can He have been able to act upon it Himself. Always, however, these seasons of a physical solitude were a means, not an end. Their sole aim was that He might then minister more usefully to His companions and the multitude. 'For their sakes I sanctify myself' was ever their motive. The sadness and dangers of undue physical loneliness were not hid from Him, and therefore He would not send any of the Seventy companionless as he set forth on his mission. At the end He Himself was left alone. 'Then all the disciples forsook him, and fled': that simple sentence must be set among the most tragic in the Gospels. 'Yet I am not alone,' He could add, 'because the Father is with me.' The trial of loneliness was also the discipline of loneliness; when the last of those timorous human friends had failed, more wholly than before He leaned upon the Father.

At no time have the special trial and discipline of loneliness pressed upon so many folk, or in so many forms, as in these days of war. There are those to whom has come bereavement so heart-breaking that they believe all sunshine to have faded from their lives for ever. The sense of separation was keen when they entered the 'den' of husband or son, saw his intimate little possessions, wondered what perils he might be facing —but now, when all hope has been surrendered to the certainty that he will return no more, the surge of desolating loneliness well-nigh overwhelms. Yet not in vain can they turn to the God of consolation, not in vain to the Lord who knows, and cares, and understands. And though the scars remain long after the lenitive of time has closed the first wound, their surest comfort will still be drawn from a source transcending all which human sympathy can offer, from the sure and certain hope of re-union, from the knowledge that each day brings nearer the end of endings.

Other forms of loneliness there are, brought about by the huge derangements of war, which are less extreme, less easily recognized, yet hard to bear, and meriting that pity from man which, we may be sure, is never denied to them by God. The affliction may be in no way caused by physical isolation; the loneliest folk, it has been remarked with full truth, are to be found in crowded cities. The war has caused much transplanting of lives, and a considerable number have now to be spent in a setting which is both new and uncongenial. Not a few of the younger women engaged upon war-work in places remote from their homes suffer much from loneliness. Solitary they are not, being packed close among hundreds or even thousands of their fellow-workers. Public authorities care sedulously for what is termed their 'social welfare'; canteens and entertainments are excellent of their kind. Yet those who feel lonely have that sense merely deepened by the community of the others, whose education and upbringing have been different, who do not, in the expressive phrase, 'speak the same language' as themselves, whose outlook and interests are

alien from their own. An affable companionship can be achieved readily enough, but they yearn vainly for intimate friends.

It were easy to name other examples. Many old folk whose homes dot the countryside might almost be termed prisoners-of-war to-day. At least the war has set an impenetrable barrier between them and those friends whom once they accounted neighbours, when a gap of a few miles meant no more than a journey of a few minutes. Now, with road transport banned, the friends and nearest neighbours might as well be a hundred miles away; the old folk can walk but little; are too infirm to struggle in a bus queue; for weeks or months they go nowhere and see no one. It is their humble sacrifice to the cause of right and they make no complaint, yet their burden of loneliness to-day is not less real because it is seldom noticed. Most lonely also in these times are many of the rural clergy and ministers. Some degree of intellectual solitude was always their lot, yet in the past they would come together at times for friendly conference and meetings, when they would study and pray, discuss their problems, compare experiences, and so return with something of new zest and courage to their cures. Few such meetings can be contrived in these days; in solitude of mind and spirit the village pastor must carry on work that has grown difficult beyond precedent. And how many others there are who, in differing ways, have to share a like burden, must face the discipline of loneliness! Retired professional people, invalids and old unmarried women, superseded school teachers and governesses—how often these are pitifully alone in their last years!

Yet 'pitifully' may prove to be a word misused. Not seldom they bear this discipline of loneliness with a courage, or even with a radiant cheerfulness, which astonishes those who know their lot. Never have they given way to self-pity, that insidious and debasing habit of mind. Like their Divine Master they have had to know loneliness, and, taught by Him, they have found the remedy. They have come into closer touch with God, and 'yet I am not alone' are words which they too can say with truth. They wait, and for them the sunset is rich with the promise of dawn. They pray, and praying are at one with all the communion of saints. They stretch out a groping hand through the gloom, and find it grasped by God, so that they go forward unafraid. The discipline of loneliness has done its perfect work; never again in life, in death, or in what lies beyond can they feel alone. The Father is with them.

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

Friends of the Truth.

BY THE REVEREND WILLIAM S. TINDAL, C.F., EDINBURGH.

'Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice.'—Jn 18^{37}.

I have tried sometimes to tell to troops the story of the life of Christ from beginning to end. Once when I had finished there was a silence, and then a man in the front row looked up and said: 'But it's all just in a book!' There have been times when men would have backed an assertion by saying that they had read it in a book or seen it in the newspapers, but now they go more cautiously. Propaganda has stalked in and very often truth has walked out. There is not the same faith in the written word.

Something of the same kind has happened in general administration. The business affairs of a community, the running of an army, call for a ceaseless flow of returns, reports, and claims. Through such a paper war a whole picture is built up in the minds of the leaders of some particular situation, but how often are men heard to remark: 'It only exists on paper,' or 'It sounds O.K. on paper. Let's go and see what it's really like.' Something has happened to make it very difficult to get at the truth.

There is a war on, of course. Marshal Wavell has remarked that war is a game, a very rough and dirty game. To deceive the enemy is of the first importance. To build up in his mind by every means possible a false picture of the situation is part of the game. But even apart from the war there has been an undermining of men's minds, a readiness to fake and falsify, which is disturbing. We seem often to be caught in systems and situations which demand such faking; and now with our trust in the truth so deliberately abused and our own love of truth so poor, many have come to the point where they say with Pilate in bitter jesting: 'What is truth?'

But there is a more hopeful side to all this. We begin to be aware of our need. There is a new hunger for the real. Whenever truth is spoken we see the real world better—God's world. We know more clearly that only God's truth can save us. Somehow we must be delivered from the world of our own make-believe, from the world as our pride would have it be. There is such a deliverer.

> 'To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice.'

Dr. Weymouth translates: 'Every one who is a friend of the truth listens to my voice.' Christians are summoned anew to be friends of the truth. It is part of the discipline of such friends to look at the teaching of the Master and to ask themselves what is implied in such teaching about the structure of the world.

Where, then, is our attention directed that we may see the truth?

This first: *There is a God.* The world must become naked again, said one of the Soviet generals; and the people seem to have believed that in becoming naked they would see that the being of God was an illusion. But is it so? War has stripped from many habits and comforts which insulated them from the real world, but what is the result? I recall my first days with troops stationed in woods, waiting for the invasion

which never came, and especially one night. It was quiet that evening. I was in my tent beneath the trees, the floor dug down three feet into the earth. Not much furniture—a camp bed and chair, a margarine box, and for carpet an empty sand bag. Round me by the light of a candle I could see the good earth and the severed roots. Above me the trees and the stars. Near by other people in their tents. Anything else? Yes. God is. Of Him Jesus says to us that when we come to Him we must say: 'Our Father . . .' There is a God. He has a Father's care for every one of us. There is always His will and power to be reckoned with. So in the end, when Pilate flourished and advertized his power before Christ, he was told simply: 'Thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above.'

There is my neighbour. 'Religion as nothing else sets a man alone,' said Dr. Oman of Cambridge. Yes; but as nothing else the Christian religion sets a man in company with his neighbours. As nothing else it compels us to recognize and reverence the being of our neighbour. Much of the New Testament teaching concerns the right recognition of those about us. Our regard for our neighbour is to be of the same order as our self regard, and even beyond all self regard to the laying down of life for friends. The darkness of these days of war is ever and again overcome and transfigured by acts which reveal such a regard. During the Battle of Britain a pilot was observed about to bale out of his blazing machine at a thousand feet over the city of London; but seeing himself to be over a thickly populated area he climbed in again and crashed the machine in the Thames. He gave his life by so doing, but we see in that last act where his thoughts were.

When it comes to Christian converse with our neighbours the Church made early discovery of one of the main effects of a man being renewed in the spirit of his mind by Jesus Christ: 'putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbour.' Lying is one of the greatest obstacles to the furtherance of life. The whole commerce of mind with mind is turned to confusion when truth is disregarded. Sympathy is checked, action becomes hesitant. The temptation is always near that to gain some advantages or to prevent ourselves and our friends meeting with the just consequences of our deeds we resort to lying. Then at once an unreal world is created and the fellowship of men is injured. Wherefore, says St. Paul, speak every man truth to his neighbour; for we are members one of another.

There is the world around us. One impression the Gospel records leave with us is the eagerness and intentness with which our Lord looked upon the world around Him. He encouraged others to 'consider' it. 'Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow.' 'Behold the fowls of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns.' Men are to use their minds and look at the world. Here surely is the temper which encourages the man of scientific outlook, such a man, for example, as Dr. Edward Wilson who went with Scott to the Antarctic. His companions found him a never-failing source of cheerfulness. Yet it came as a shock to some of them to learn from his diary that he held a service by himself up in the crow's nest every week. On the return journey from the Pole, already half starved and strained, he made a detour to obtain some specimens of rocks and added them to the overburdened sledges. But then what took Wilson to the Antarctic was the conviction that God meant men to find out all they could about His works.

There is God who made all things; there is my neighbour; there is the world around me. There is also a man's self. Much is said in the New Testament about the true life of the self, but here let us realize afresh that every self bearing the name of Christ is called to submit to the discipline of truth that so he may become the friend of truth. At an army breakfast table a famous general was asked: 'How would you define discipline?' There was a pause and then the answer: 'Unselfishness.' Another pause, and then—'Yes, that covers most of it.' The discipline of truth takes us out of ourselves and turns us to look upon and listen to Jesus Christ who said: 'Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice.'

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

Defeatism and some Antidotes.

BY THE REVEREND GEO. JOHNSTONE JEFFREY, B.D., GLASGOW.

'So, up with your listless hands!
Strengthen your weak knees!
Make straight paths for your feet!'
He $12^{12\cdot13}$ (Moffatt).

Some of you may have lived for a time with a person suffering from nervous depression. In that case, you will know that while there will always be a place for understanding sympathy, a crisis may arise which calls for judicious severity.

Evidently the writer of this letter was of this opinion. He is dealing with people who had been sorely chastened. They had reached breaking-point. He knew that lavish sympathy would unman them. So he adopts the stern method and becomes surgical. By three peremptory commands—you might almost call them taunts—he seeks to awaken the hero that slumbers in the poorest of men.

Up with your listless hands! The mood of spiritual listlessness is as old as the human heart. Its language is familiar. 'Who will show us any good?' So much of our life consists in climbing hills of sand. The forces of evil in this world are powerful almost to omnipotence and subtle almost to devilry. 'The battle goes sore against us to the going down of the sun.' Weary of the losing struggle ourselves, we watch others spending themselves in some crusade against gigantic wrongs, and the only heartening we offer them is to mutter:

The task you undertake
Is numbering sands and drinking oceans dry.

Now, on the face of it, much of our human life to-day seems to justify this sunless creed and its dreary apathy. What one generation achieves at a heavy price is often lost, and the next must win it all over again. The 'war to end war' turns out to be the war to begin another and more terrible war. It is the same in the conflict within our own breasts. It is humbling to think that a man may find himself at sixty struggling with the temptations that beset him at sixteen. Hence the hands that droop by our sides in cynical despair. 'Who will show us any good.?'

The text has something to say in answer to this mood of defeatism. 'Up with your listless hands!' This is a mood not to be reasoned with but to be strangled. Two considerations may kindle in us the hope of victory.

First of all, let us get it wrought into the fibres of our being that life is one long campaign. Let us put out of our thinking for ever the idea that the good life will go with its own momentum. We row against the stream, and the moment we take our hands from the oars is the moment when we begin to go backward. 'The price of liberty,' we cannot be told too often, 'is eternal vigilance.' We must cease praying for some ivory tower, where we will be no longer a harassed combatant but a complacent, uncommitted spectator. As has been well said, 'Every city of refuge I enter, I find from the moment I enter it to be in a state of siege.'

The other incentive to courage may be stated thus. It was a favourite saying of James Denney that '*when we choose our creed, we choose our company.*' Every time we allow ourselves a mood of moral defeatism, we are proving ourselves traitors to the memory of the loyal and the true and the brave of all generations—the men who spent themselves in some noble cause and at last 'died in faith, not having received the promises but having seen them afar off.' To add to Denney's saying, 'when we choose our creed, we choose *our Leader.*' Consider Him who appeared on this earth and, knowing all the while how it would end, fulfilled a ministry of love to mankind that has held in thrall the imagination and the devotion of the centuries. These hands were toiling hands. One day they were pierced hands. They were never listless hands.

> Go, labour on, spend and be spent,
> Thy joy to do the Father's will;
> It is the way the Master went;
> Should not the servant tread it still?

Then listen to the second trumpet call. *Straighten your weak knees.* This is hard hitting! No man of spirit likes to be called weak-kneed.

David Livingstone was once toiling through the jungle at the head of his native porters. He was himself bearing his own share of the burdens and had set the pace for the file. One of the natives, unaware that Livingstone understood his dialect, began to say to his mate: 'The white man will never last this pace. His knees will soon give way and we will have a rest.' Livingstone, like a canny Scot, said nothing, unless inwardly—'We will see whose knees give way first.' Needless to say, it was not *his.*

'Straighten your sagging knees.' The Devil has many wiles and stratagems for all of us, but here is one of his favourites. It is to whisper to us in our low moods: 'You are no ordinary person. On the contrary, you are a sensitive soul, a man apart, needing special sympathy, special immunities.' The healthiest answer to the craven within us is that of the text: 'Straighten your sagging knees.' When a youth is tempted to succumb to self-pity and ask: 'Did ever man suffer as I have suffered in the battle between the flesh and the spirit?', then the word to be thundered in his ears is the word of the Apostle: 'There hath no temptation taken *you* but such as is common to man: but God is faithful who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able.' In a word, if you are a man, then expect the temptations of a man. 'Strengthen your feeble knees.' It is the same in the struggle for intellectual certainty. If you have a man's mind, be prepared for a man's doubts and difficulties. Go out on the lonely quest of a creed which will be true at least for you, giving you conviction enough to live and die on, and if, in the end, seeking a new continent, like Chesterton's voyager you land at Brighton pier, do not be daunted. If others have discovered these truths before you, they are new for you. In the moral struggle and in the intellectual, God is no respecter of persons. The word is 'Stand upon thine own feet, and I will speak unto thee.' Step out of your securities and immunities, and be a man among men.

> Forth from the casemate on the plain,
> Where honour has the world to gain.
> Pour forth and bravely do your part,
> O Knights of the unshielded heart
> Forth and forever forward! Out
> From prudent turret and redoubt,
> And in the mellay charge amain
> To fall, but yet to rise again.

Finally, *Make straight paths for your feet lest that which is lame be turned out of the way.* In plain words, 'Think of yourselves as pioneers making a path for the halting companions who follow you.'

There are two ways in which we can regard the one life we have to live. The first—and lower—is to conceive of it as an entity in itself, regardless of what went before it or will come after it. If you wish to have an idea of this aspect at its basest, you may recall the brutally selfish dictum of Louis XV. on the eve of the French Revolution. 'It will last my time. After me—the deluge.' This is the callous creed of the careerist—the man whose one concern is to get the utmost out of life for his own ends as long as life lasts.

The writer of this letter depicts for us a shining contrast to all this. He passes before our gaze one generation after another of the faithful, each receiving some precious, hard-won inheritance from its predecessor and handing it on—enhanced, if not perfected—to that which succeeds. Here

is what he says of the long procession of great souls as they march down the ages. 'These all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise, God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.'

Conceived in such a lofty way, our personal life ceases to be a broken, meaningless fragment. *It becomes a link in a chain.* It is putting the same thought in a more intimate way to say that there is no legacy like sterling character. Says Thomas Carlyle, 'I can see my dear father's life as the sunk pillar on which mine was to rise and be built.'

The other related thought is our duty to the future. 'Make straight paths for your feet and for the feet of those who will follow you.' This is the call to be pioneers of the spirit. We are living in days when this sacred principle is being for ever enshrined by the sacrifice of countless gallant youths on land and sea and in the air. Which of us but fears to be unworthy of their wonderful example? What an enlargement of our personality to think that, long after we are gone, our influence may be speeding on through other lives, creative and inspiring! Can there be a higher task for teachers and students than to toil after truth 'as blind men yearn for light,' to the undermining of error and superstition and bigotry in future generations? Could anything inspire a civic or social worker to dedicated service like the thought that his memory will be perpetuated and his labours rewarded by homes made clean and wholesome, by lives passed in ever improving conditions of labour and leisure and refinement? Could there be any higher incentive for a Christian parent than so to win the battle of his own soul that his children after him will find it easier to believe in goodness and in God? Give your life a great setting: blessed and endowed by a noble past, let us give ourselves to the building of a new and better world, in the brave self-forgetfulness of those who can say:

> Others shall sing the song,
> Others shall right the wrong—
> Finish what I begin,
> And all I fail of win.
>
> What matter, I or they?
> Mine or another's day,
> So the right word be said
> And life the sweeter made?
>
> Ring, bells in unreared steeples,
> The joy of unborn peoples!
> Sound, trumpets far off blown,
> Your triumph is my own!

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

What kind of a Universe do you live in?

BY THE REVEREND DERRICK CUTHBERT, B.A., B.D., LAXEY, ISLE OF MAN.

'Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?'—Mt 6^{25}.

In one sense, of course, we all live in the same universe; but in another sense we each live in a universe of our own making, or at least of our own selection. Here, for example, is a man who lives in a large universe: his interests are wide, his knowledge is continually being expanded by careful observation, reading and thought; his sympathies are broad and his impulses generous. Next door to him lives a man who inhabits a small universe: his interests are so limited that they hardly extend beyond the boundaries of family life and daily work. With the whole world open before him he is content to be wrapped up in his own small concerns.

Then there are those people who live in a universe of luck. Not for them the way of painstaking efforts to improve themselves; not for them the hard road of study; not for them the practice of thrift and the careful husbandry of their resources. They do not think that the universe is constituted in such a way as to reward this kind of thing. Their universe is one in which rewards are doled out by sheer accident. They dribble away their money in lucky bets and lucky tickets, always hoping some day to grasp one of the glittering prizes that seem to dangle just out of reach.

Without multiplying instances any further it is plain that men and women choose and fashion for themselves the different universes in which they habitually live. And, according to the universe they construct, they find in life achievement or frustration, joy or misery. When a man tells you he has a grudge against life, or that the universe is unfriendly, his condemnation is usually not the condemnation of the world as God made it but of the universe he has constructed for himself. It is as if God gave to us the opportunity of living in a palace full of beauty and light, furnished with the treasures of the ages, and we chose to live in some dark corner of a basement, or in some miserable hut of our own design constructed of poor stuff no capable builder would ever use. And then, surveying this dwelling, we protest to the world that we have had a raw deal, or that we do not think much of God's handiwork!

In the light of all this there is some point in asking the apparently absurd question: what is the nature of the universe in which *you* live? Is it small or large? Is it ruled by luck or by some more rational principle? Is it a universe containing a little tin-pot god whom you try to bribe and cajole to do your will, or is it a universe sustained and guided by the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ?

All these are important issues, but the particular question I want to ask now is this: is your universe a universe of things or of persons?

It has been the general habit of mankind in recent generations to live in a universe of things. Is it not true, for example, that for most of us the supreme aim in life has been to acquire a quantity of solid and endurable possessions? When we have spoken of a 'successful' man, every one has known that we were not referring to the cultivation of the brain, or to the development of the soul, but to the successful pursuit of wealth, or to the attainment of a position in life which carried

with it the possession of money as a matter of course.

Again, we have been far more concerned about quantity than about quality of life; more concerned to prolong our days than to fill them with true nobility and worth. We point with pride to the progress of medical knowledge in our civilization, and indeed we have every right to do so. Even greater achievements are promised for the future, when our splendid medical resources are made still more widely available. Our record in this matter is truly a glorious one. But I sometimes wonder what a doctor must have felt as he laboured in some noble hospital with unremitting care and patience to save the life of a child, knowing all the time that when his work was done his little patient would go back to the slum from which she came, and where the living of a virtuous life is made as hard as circumstance can make it. Or what must he have felt, in the days before the war, as he gave his skill to the healing of the body of a working man for whom there was no work. Preservation of life—we have done wonders there, but we have dismally failed to make life worth living for thousands of our people.

In our thinking about our own lives we have put the emphasis on quantity rather than quality. Health has loomed larger in our thoughts than morality.

If we were asked what we understood the word 'God' to signify, multitudes of us have replied—if we had any answer at all—'the Creator, the Being responsible for the existence of the world.' Our concept has been of a vague Someone who, from an immense distance, doled out necessities to the human race; a magnified Mr. Woolworth, with an inexhaustible emporium. The kind of God, in other words, who, like ourselves, was chiefly interested in *things*.

What, then, have been the consequences of living like this in a universe of things? First of all, God has been robbed, and His purposes frustrated. The thought of God as Creator and Sustainer of all things cannot be omitted from an adequate understanding of His nature; but to regard Him as a universal Provider and nothing more is one of those half-truths that are worse than a lie. The only thought of God that will do justice to what the best men have known of Him and said about Him; the only thought of God that will make sense of human life and of the universe, is that which is implicit in all that Jesus declared concerning Him, namely, that He made us for fellowship with Himself, fellowship after the pattern of an earthly father's best fellowship with his children. To ignore this; to exclude it from your universe; to regard God the Father as no better than a machine turning out things for us to use, is to rob Him of the communion which He desires, and therefore, so far as we are concerned, to frustrate His purpose in creating us.

The second consequence of living in a universe of things is, paradoxically enough, that we have not really possessed that mastery over things about which we have so often boasted. Things, in fact, have mastered us, for we have lived our personal and corporate lives under the tyranny of things, a tyranny which has blighted life, robbed us of leisure, defrauded us of mental and spiritual adventure, and made some of us practically indistinguishable from the objects in which we have been immersed.

Thirdly, since the amount of things available, however lavish the supply, has always come short of our insatiable greed for possession, we human beings have spent a good deal of our time competing against each other. Within each nation a central authority—the government—has usually managed to put a bridle upon this competition, to keep it within bounds, and to hold a balance, more or less fair, between its citizens. But between the nations there has been no central authority or control, except of course the ill-fated League of Nations, which was far too altruistic a conception to survive in a universe of things, and therefore competition has been pursued to its logical conclusion time and again, involving more and yet more nations in the holocaust of war. And war makes plain the grim fact that a universe of things is a self-destructive universe, for in war we use things to destroy both things and persons.

It is sheer ignorance and folly to blame God for this; to say, as some do, that His putting us into such a universe is proof that He is either incompetent or hostile. It is worse than folly—it is blasphemy—to talk at length about the pressure of economic laws inherent in the universe which compel us to fly at one another's throats. Such laws may be part of the structure of the universe of things, but that is not the universe in which God intends us to live. That is the universe we have fashioned for ourselves, and if living in it means misery, then *we* are the ones to bear the blame.

The universe in which God calls us to live is a universe of persons; a universe that is, in which personal life and personal values hold pride of place. Things are found in it of course, but their place is always secondary and subordinate. In God's universe, as Jesus said, 'the life is more than meat, and the body more than raiment.' The aim is not material wealth nor yet length of days but what the Gospel calls 'eternal life,' which is not merely life beyond death, but also life in touch with, and sharing the nature of, eternal reality; life made up of those graces and virtues which make a man a good citizen of this world and of the heavenly city.

The basis of life in that universe is that God is known as a personal God. Hence His purpose in making men is fulfilled. The Father who is ever seeking His worshippers finds them, and His gifts are rightly used. Things never become masters over human life; no feverish quest for them leads men into the exploitation and oppression of other men. They are always the servants of personal life. And a universe in which persons matter most is a universe in which human society becomes a fellowship.

Such an outline of the universe of persons sounds, I dare say, like a sketch of an impossible Utopia which has no chance of ever coming true. But

before we so dismiss it let us face these questions. Is not that after all the kind of universe in which God intends us to live? Is it not indeed the only kind of universe in which men, quite literally, can go on living? The universe of things is breaking down under its own Nemesis; wrong in the very foundation on which it was built, it could not hope to endure. What is to take its place? The same kind of thing all over again, with the prospect, twenty-five years ahead, of a fall that will bring even greater destruction and suffering than that which is around us to-day? God forbid! Then what is the alternative? The alternative is that we shall move onwards the way God is calling us, the way He has been calling us for generations by the mouth of His spokesmen, the way He is calling us now by the terrible object-lesson that is before our eyes. We *must* learn to live in a universe of persons, and we must begin now.

Who shall teach us? Who but He who forsook all things for the sake of men, and endured the worst that they could do to Him with steadfast goodwill, because He held them, even in their weakness and their wickedness, well worth dying for? Jesus is the first who ever lived completely in God's universe of persons; and He overcame death that we who would possess His spirit and walk in His ways may share His victory over the impulses that hold men prisoners in a universe of things, and that we may live in the universe where He is, and find there our joy and our peace.

The Proto-Luke Hypothesis: A Rejoinder.

By the Reverend Principal Vincent Taylor, D.D., Wesley College, Headingley, Leeds.

In the April number of 'The Expository Times' the Rev. C. S. Petrie has outlined some of the difficulties which stand in the way of assenting to the Proto-Luke Hypothesis, particularly in the Galilean section, Lk 3^{1}–9^{50}; and, as he has frequently referred to my arguments in *Behind the Third Gospel*, I welcome the opportunity of replying to his criticisms.

I.

1. Mr. Petrie begins by drawing attention to two factors which, he says, are not always observed in the exposition of the hypothesis. His first is that, if and when traces of Mark's influence seem to show themselves, 'they must be explained, and not simply explained away.' I wholeheartedly agree with this principle, and I hope I have not been unmindful of it in the meticulous investigation in pp. 33–143 of the work already mentioned. Secondly, Mr. Petrie observes that, except in the broadest terms, at present Q cannot be satisfactorily delineated. Even its unity cannot be taken for granted. Again, I should agree; but I cannot subscribe to the contention that 'Q' should be used to describe 'only that material which has close verbal similarity' in Matthew and Luke. This view would reduce the source to about 120 verses, and there are good reasons why the verbal agreement in the remaining 100 or so verses commonly assigned to Q is slighter, in Streeter's M Hypothesis and W. Bussmann's discussions.

2. Mr. Petrie queries my contention that, while the Proto-Luke Hypothesis is not dependent on any one view of Q, there is an advantage in assuming, as a basis for inquiry, orthodox views of its nature. My point was that the hypothesis would not fall to the ground even if Q is an oral source, or a combination of sources. This opinion, I think, does not prevent me from saying that the discussion of Luke's use of Q 'is indispensable' or from assuming the generally accepted view of the source.

3. Mr. Petrie further maintains that the alternation of blocks of Markan and non-Markan material in Luke lends no support to the Proto-Luke Hypothesis, since the blocks are of such diverse size and distribution and no deduction is possible as to the unity of the non-Markan sections. I submit that the question of the size of the blocks is irrelevant and that much depends on what we mean by 'unity.' No one will deny, especially since the rise of Form-Criticism, that the structure of the Synoptic Gospels is loose and disjointed. The claim of those who support the Proto-Luke Hypothesis is that the non-Markan parts of Luke constitute a readable whole. My *First Draft of St. Luke's Gospel* permits this claim to be put to the test. If those who dissent from this view would print the Markan sections, we should then be able to see if they are not *membra disjecta*. This argument does not seem to me to be weakened by the claim that the omission of Lk 7^{2-35} would not seriously disturb the connexion of the remaining narratives. The other example given by Mr. Petrie, Lk 8^{22-56}, happens to be an indubitable *Markan* section.

4. A further objection raised is that supporters of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis start at the end and

not at the beginning of Luke. Since Mr. Petrie concedes that we must be allowed freedom to present the theory in our own way, I might pass by this objection. But there is a reason for beginning at the end. The end, as he says, 'is the most difficult section of the Gospel in its relation to Mark.' It follows, therefore, that if we can show that in the Passion Narrative, and, I would add, in the Eschatological Discourse of Lk 21, Mark is used as a *supplementary* source, a presumption, to say the least, is established that the same is true of the earlier parts of Luke. 'If,' as I ask in *Behind the Third Gospel*, 'St. Luke uses Mark as his principal authority, why does he abandon that source at its final and most important point?' (p. 184).

5. I cannot agree that the sixfold date in Lk $3^{1f.}$, and the Genealogy of Lk 3^{23-38} 'do not affect the hypothesis either way.' It is beside the point to urge that, even if Proto-Luke is rejected, the Genealogy follows the first reference to Jesus in the main narrative of Lk 3. The point is, Why does it not appear in the Birth Stories, as in Matthew? It does not seem adequate to say that the Genealogy 'on any showing, is an awkward insertion.' If originally, in a first draft of the Gospel, it stood immediately after Jesus was mentioned for the first time, we have a simple answer to the question why it now stands in Lk 3 and not in Lk 1–2. Mr. Petrie does not discuss the relevance of the date. The argument favourable to the Proto-Luke Hypothesis is the modest claim that 'as the introduction to Proto-Luke, this somewhat elaborate date is naturally accounted for, and the fact that the Baptist is referred to as if he were being mentioned in the Third Gospel for the first time raises no difficulty' (*Behind the Third Gospel*, p. 194).

II.

So far, I think, we may not unjustly say that Mr. Petrie's attack on the Proto-Luke Hypothesis is matter of outposts. He joins battle in his critical discussion of Lk 3^{1}–9^{50}, his principal submissions being (1) that the divergences from Mark's order in this section imply that the Markan order, even when it was altered, was at least known and supplies the main setting, and (2) that portions of Luke are assigned to Proto-Luke which are, in fact, Markan. The best method of approach will be to take the different Lukan sections in which these issues arose.

1. *Lk* $3^{19f.}$.—With Mr. Petrie's argument that this passage, by completing John's part in the story, is an improvement, I agree; but his further statement, for which proof is not offered, that it replaces or summarizes Mk $6^{17f.}$, is less convincing. The two passages appear to be merely parallel versions of the same tradition; there is no case for asserting the dependence of Luke on Mark.

2. *Lk* 4^{16-30}.—I cannot agree that this passage is 'an amplification or a replacement of Mk 6^{1-6}.' No evidence is presented, nor is an adequate explanation given of the fact that Luke sets this narrative earlier in his account of the Galilean Ministry. This deficiency is not met by saying: 'Whatever the reason for this, signs of rearrangement are not wanting,' for the reasons mentioned by Mr. Petrie depend on its present (Markan) context in Luke. 'Not only,' he says 'does the reference to Capernaum in *v.* 23 now anticipate *v.* 31, but *v.* 23, scarcely expected after *vv.* 14–15, does not well accord with *vv.* 32, 36.' What is strange, we must ask, in the introduction of a story about Nazareth after the reference to Galilee and its synagogues in Lk $4^{14f.}$, and why should there not be a passing allusion to Capernaum? Verses 31, 32, and 36 are all Markan passages, and the difficulty of relating *v.* 23 thereto is effectively explained by the Proto-Luke Hypothesis, namely, that Lk 4^{31-44} is a Markan addition to Proto-Luke. In other words, with Proto-Luke presupposed, the alleged signs of rearrangement are explained. Further, Mr. Petrie has not disposed of Streeter's point that Matthew and Luke *agree* in mentioning that Jesus went first of all to *Nazareth*, except for the formal objection that both Evangelists, in agreement with Mark, say that He went 'into Galilee.' The fact remains that both Evangelists, but not Mark, mention Nazareth; and both use the form Ναζαρά which is not found anywhere else in the New Testament. A rearrangement of Mark which brings about this striking agreement of Luke with Matthew is not easily credible.

3. *Lk* 5^{1-11}.—The claim that this narrative 'replaces Mk 1^{16-20}' is supported by the argument 'James and John are brought in abruptly,' and that 'there is a similarity in *v.* 11 to Mk 1^{18}, especially in the plural response to Jesus' call, which in Luke is addressed only to Peter.' Mr. Petrie rightly observes that 'these points must not be unduly pressed,' but then adds: 'but they do agree with the general impression that the Markan order, even when it was altered, was at least known and supplies the main setting.' What is the justification for this general impression? We must be able to give a reasonable explanation of the fact that Luke omits the excellent narrative of Mk 1^{16-20} and gives an inferior account of the Call of Simon *in another and later context*. I prefer to think that when the Evangelist first wrote Lk 5^{1-11} he had no knowledge of Mk 1^{16-20}.

4. *Lk* 6^{12-19}.—Here Mr. Petrie maintains that I am not justified in regarding this passage as non-Markan. With many scholars he holds that it is a recast of Mk 3^{7-19}. I recognize that this is a

lebatable point in my presentation of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis; but it is so far from being a vital issue that, even if the common view is accepted, no essential damage is done to the hypothesis. But I am far from being convinced that Lk 6^{12-19} is Markan. The order of the two narratives, 6^{12-16} and $^{17-19}$, is the reverse of that found in Mark, the percentage of verbal agreement is low, and there are material differences in content. I accept Mr. Petrie's correction that there are 25 words common to Lk 6^{17-19} and Mk 3^{7-12}, and not 21, as I stated in *Behind the Third Gospel* (p. 82).[1] But are the 25 words impressive? Six of them are cases of καί, two of αὐτοῦ, two are prepositions, and one a definite article. The only common phrases of importance are πλῆθος πολύ (in Mark in reverse order) and ἅπτ(εσθαι) αὐτοῦ; and it is open to question if we ought not to read πολὺς ὄχλος in Mk 3^{7} instead of πολὺ πλῆθος.[2] A very interesting question is raised when Mr. Petrie writes: 'It is remarkable that in both Matthew and Luke the Sermon is given immediately following their use of this same Markan passage, in which each has much less in common with the other than with Mark.' He makes this observation in support of the view that Lk 6^{17-19} is based on Mk 3^{7-12}, which apparently Matthew has also used in Mt $4^{24f.}$. Assuming for the moment that this opinion is sound, we must ask: In that case why do Matthew and Luke *independently* agree in introducing the Sermon at this point? *There is nothing in Mark to account for this coincidence*, since Mark does not record the Sermon. Must we not, therefore, infer that, whether they are using Mk 3^{7-12} or not, their agreement points to the use of a *non*-Markan source or sources? Q, M, L, or oral tradition are possible suggestions; but, for the reason given, *not Mark*. But, if so, Mr. Petrie's argument, instead of strengthening his claim, that the source of Lk 6^{17-19}, weakens it. (It also raises the question whether Mt 4^{23-5}, despite the agreements of 4^{25} with Mk $3^{7f.}$, is based on Mark.)

[1] On the question of verbal agreement Mr. Petrie writes: 'Professor Creed has occasion to complain that "Dr. Taylor's numerical method of dealing with the words peculiar to each evangelist is not satisfactory without reference to the actual similarities and dissimilarities in each case," and the discussion justifies the complaint.' The truth is, as I pointed out in my *Formation of the Gospel Tradition* (p. 197), Professor Creed had no occasion to make this observation, since it is without justification. I know of no instance in *Behind the Third Gospel* in which, in addition to making use of the 'numerical method' (which, incidentally, is not mine), I have failed to discuss 'the actual similarities and dissimilarities in each case.' In that volume I gave two large pages to the discussion of such points in Lk 6^{12-19}.

[2] In Mk 3^{7} πολὺς ὄχλος is read by D 372 bcefff^{2}i vg sy^{s} ^{pe}. In Mk 3^{8} πλῆθος πολύ is omitted by Wabc sy^{s}. πλῆθος is found nowhere else in Mark.

Some other source, or sources, existed which connected the Sermon with a description of, or reference to, crowds assembled from distant parts. That, to use Mr. Petrie's words, 'the independent Proto-Luke should have alighted on the same striking sequence' (as in Mt 4^{23}–$5^{1ff.}$), is more significant than he allows; *the agreement points steadily beyond Mark*.

5. *Lk* 3^{1}–4^{30}.—Mr. Petrie contests Streeter's claim that this passage is non-Markan. He argues that 'if the ascription of 3^{1-22} and 4^{1-13} to Q is not wholly arbitrary' (a somewhat grudging admission), 'certainly the complete proscription of Mark from these verses is not warranted.' If this statement means that Markan phrases may have been added to a non-Markan passage, there is a case for argument, but not if more is claimed. As Mr. Petrie says 'the number of verses resembling Mark is certainly few.' From those he cites ($3^{2b.\ 4.\ 16.\ 21-22}$ 4^{1-2}), we must, I think, exclude the Markan origin of $3^{2b.\ 4.\ 21f.}$, and $4^{1f.}$. In 3^{2b} the agreements are trifling; in 3^{4} they are practically limited to a quotation derived probably from current Christian tradition; in $3^{21f.}$ they are found mainly in the words: 'Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased,' an agreement which might appear in the most independent narratives of the Baptism, but which may be delusive if, as I suspect, the original Lukan reading was: 'Thou art my Son: to-day have I begotten thee' (*The Historical Evidence for the Virgin Birth*, 24 ff.; *Behind the Third Gospel*, 77). In Lk $4^{1f.}$ little weight can be laid on the concurrence of Luke and Mark in the phrases 'during forty days' and 'being tempted.' We are left then with 3^{3} and ^{16}; and, indeed, with the two phrases: κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν (3^{3}), and: οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ (3^{16}), since the other agreements are no more than might be expected in parallel narratives. These phrases are susceptible of the same explanation; popular tradition, or Q, would account for them; or, again, they may have been added (with 3^{22b}) at the time when the Third Gospel was completed. They afford too slender a basis for the view that Mk 1^{1-13} is Luke's primary source; and, in consequence, Streeter's estimate of the non-Markan character of Lk 3^{1}–4^{30} must be held to stand.

The remaining sections, Lk 6^{20}–8^{3} (non-Markan) and Lk 8^{4}–9^{50} (Markan), do not call for discussion.

III.

In view of what is said above I suggest that the divergences of order, so far from implying the knowledge and use of Mark, appear to have been made in ignorance of the Second Gospel and in deference to non-Markan tradition. I turn now to the second main difficulty, the considerable amount

of Markan material in Lk 3^{1}–9^{50}. Mr. Petrie points out that in this section 'there is at least as much Markan as "non-Markan" material,' and that 'whatever the sources, the sequence is so close to Mark as to suggest some superior recognition.' In this section, he observes, 'there is a nice balance between what is from Mark and what is not.' 'Out of 326 verses, 156 (=47.9 per cent) are admittedly Markan'; and, if we include Lk 6^{12-19}, 'the balance would just swing in Mark's favour.' Let us, for the sake of argument, accept this figure of just over 50 per cent., *pace* those critics, including Mr. Petrie, who stress the limitations of the 'numerical method.' What follows from this percentage? Mr. Petrie's submission is that 'in respect of quantity, at any rate, Mark is not here over-ruled.' Presumably, this observation is an understatement of the objection that Luke's use of Mark is not that accorded to a supplementary source, and that, in consequence, the Proto-Luke Hypothesis is found wanting.

There are, I think, clear and convincing reasons why this objection fails.

1. In the first place, the extent to which a source is used, even if it is considerable, does not, in itself, stamp it as primary. It is conceivable, and possible, that the major part of a writing may consist of subsequent additions.

2. Secondly, the fact that Luke follows the Markan sequence so closely simply illustrates the manner in which he uses sources. The same feature is seen in the Passion Narrative, and is widely recognized as a mark of his editorial method in his use of Q.

3. Thirdly, as against the view that Mark is the primary source, Luke has omitted those elements in Mk 1^{1}–9^{40} which give to the Second Gospel such structural unity as it possesses. The introduction, 1^{1-13}, is ignored, except possibly in Lk $3^{3b.\ 16}$ and ^{22b}. The editorial passage, 1^{14}, and the description of the Message of Jesus in 1^{15}, are passed by. The references to Capernaum in 1^{21}, and to Galilee in 1^{39}, are retained; but thenceforward there is a whole series of omissions which cannot be explained by the necessities of abbreviation. Among these may be mentioned: the references to Capernaum in 2^{1} and to 'the sea' in 2^{13} and 4^{1}; the precise temporal statement in 4^{35}; the allusion to the itinerant ministry of Jesus in 6^{6b}. Mk 6^{45}–8^{26} as a whole is omitted, carrying with it the loss of the references to Bethsaida in 6^{45} (but cf. Lk 9^{10}), to Gennesaret in 6^{53}, to the secret journey to the borders of Tyre (7^{24}), and through Sidon to the Sea of Galilee and Decapolis (7^{31}), and to Dalmanutha (8^{10}). Further, there is no mention of Caesarea Philippi (8^{27}), or of the secret journey through Galilee (9^{30}), or of Capernaum in 9^{33}. In short, St. Luke, the most historically minded of the Evangelists, abandons the linch-pins of the Markan structure, not to speak of his omission of many vivid details in the stories of the Gerasene Demoniac, the Feeding of the Five Thousand, and the Epileptic Lad. These omissions are strange if Mark 'supplies the main setting' of the Third Gospel.[1]

4. Fourthly, and concurrently with the above, topical as Markan sections often are, they are still more topical in Luke. This is a point to which I have frequently drawn attention (cf. *Behind the Third Gospel*, 126–35; *The Gospels*, 44). In the section under discussion it is clearly illustrated in Lk 4^{31-44} 5^{12}–6^{11} 8^{4-21} 8^{22}–9^{17} 9^{18-50}.

5. Lastly, in so far as it is limited to Lk 3^{1}–9^{50}, Mr. Petrie's argument is delusive. In the nature of the case it is impossible either to defend or attack the Proto-Luke Hypothesis without considering the Third Gospel as a whole. Conclusions based on any part of it can only be tentative, and, unless related to the whole, they may be misleading. How true this is, may be seen from the single consideration that, if Mr. Petrie had selected the second of the three main sections into which he divides the Gospel, namely, Lk 9^{51}–8^{14}, and had treated it with the limitations he has observed in discussing Lk 3^{1}–9^{50}, he would have been led to the erroneous conclusion that Luke never used, and was ignorant of, St. Mark's Gospel. The truth is that those who reject the Proto-Luke Hypothesis must match the industry of those who have proposed it. They must not be satisfied with isolated forays on portions of the Passion Narrative, or even with attacks in force on the Galilean Section. They must be able to re-establish the contention, now wholly out of date, that Mark is the main source used in Luke and is the framework of the whole.[2]

[1] Compare the following non-Markan passages in Lk 3^{1}–9^{50}: $3^{1f.}$ $4^{1.\ 14f.\ 16}$ 5^{1} $7^{1.\ 11}$ 8^{1-3}.

[2] Mr. Petrie, I think, has unintentionally misrepresented the quotation from my *Formation of the Gospel Tradition* (p. 200) which he discusses in the last paragraph of his article. The context in which the passage appears makes the meaning reasonably clear. I have no intention of claiming that the Lukan Preface contains an allusion to Proto-Luke. On the contrary, I am seeking to meet Bussmann's contention that the hypothesis is not supported by Lk 1^{1-4}. I therefore argue that Luke was under no obligation to mention Proto-Luke in his Preface; but that, if, in fact, it was his composition, there is increased force in his claim to have 'traced the course of all things accurately from the first.'

Contributions and Comments.

A New Interpretation of Psalm cxxvii. 2^{b} (כֵּן יִתֵּן לִידִידוֹ שֵׁנָא).

THE interpretation of this psalm and verse is indeed a crux, and I have been interested to see the brave attempt at a solution made by Mr. Edward Edwards in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for October 1942. May I also offer an explanation which has been long in my mind? That the two strophes of the psalm (as I should prefer to call them) balance each other in sense has been perceived by Dr. Oesterley, though he assigns them an independent origin; and it may be added that they balance each other in metre also. I suggest that the above words link them together. One might translate, 'Even so it is that he giveth to his beloved in sleep.' Just as it is Yahweh's care that matters for house or city, so that all is useless without it, in the same way it is He who provides strong sons to be a defence to the home, in a manner naturally connected with sleep.

It may be helpful to compare the parable of Mk 4$^{26-29}$. The man is conscious of having sown the seed, but it grows 'he knoweth not how,' until finally 'the crop is ripe.' The growth of the babe is also something hidden and mysterious, something readily associated in the mind with slumber and the silence of the night and the nuptial couch, as is likewise the actual conception, though it does not seem necessary to lay any exclusive emphasis on the beginning of the process. Thus the mention of 'sleep' may well be a poetical device to hint at the ignorance and helplessness of the father, which means that he must look to Yahweh for succour and success, no less than the builders and defenders of the city.

C. LATTEY, S.J.

Heythrop College, Oxon.

Entre Nous.

George Adam Smith.

Professor S. A. Cook contributed to the Proceedings of the British Academy an appreciation of the late Principal of Aberdeen University, and this has been published in pamphlet form (Milford; 2s. 6d.). It contains a large amount of interesting information about the ancestry, the career and the labours of the distinguished and beloved scholar who lived such a full, varied, and richly influential life of eighty-six years.

His great-grandfather had a rope-walk and sail-making business at Leith, to which were added a barber's shop and a club for sailors kept by his grandfather. The latter 'came out' at the Disruption and was ordained an elder in the Free Church. The sea-connexion may account for the love of travel and interest in geography in G.A.S. whose father (a missionary and biographer of missionaries) was one of the promoters of the Royal Scottish Geographical Society.

G.A.S. was educated at the Royal High School, Edinburgh, and then at the University where he took the ordinary M.A., apparently without honours. His career at the University (like that of A. B. Davidson, his great teacher) was undistinguished, but he added to his studies a course on political economy which may have directed his mind to social and economic problems. In later days these were to be one of his main interests. During these years he numbered among his friends R. W. Barbour, John Kelman, Lord Haldane, Robertson Nicoll, Andrew Seth Pringle-Pattison, W. R. Sorley, and Henry Drummond.

Summer semesters were spent at Tübingen and Leipzig during his divinity course, and it happened that when he was at Leipzig he acted as a foreign correspondent to a London paper. It happened thus. Henry Lucy, a friend of his father's, commissioned G.A.S. to proceed to Berlin as correspondent. This he did, travelling fourth-class like other students. He fell in with a waiter who was going to serve in the hotel where Disraeli, Salisbury, and other British statesmen were living. This waiter smuggled him in as a member of the staff, and in the passages and rooms 'our Berlin correspondent' succeeded in picking up enough to satisfy his editor.

When Robertson Smith was suspended from his professorial functions by the Free Church General Assembly, G.A.S. was appointed to conduct the classes. One of his first acts was to call on Robertson Smith in the hope of receiving advice. 'And what would *you* do,' asked the fiery little scholar, 'and where would *you* be were I to ignore the finding of the General Assembly and continue to teach my class?' To which G.A.S. replied, 'I should take my place on one of the benches,' and after that there was no question of their friendship.

It is well known that General Allenby was immensely indebted to what is perhaps G.A.S.'s greatest work, *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, a book so vivid, so enriching, so

stupendous in its detailed scholarship and so fascinating in its style that no words could overpraise it. Allenby is said to have studied the Bible and the H.G.H.L. every morning, and Sir Archibald Wavell says that an officer who served under Allenby told Mrs. Sorley (G.A.S.'s sister) that when in that dry and dusty land the water-supply ran short the army was able to trace, locate, and revive the use of many long-forgotten wells through a study of this great work. Mr. Lloyd George claimed the credit of introducing it to Allenby's notice, but Professor Cook thinks that Allenby did not need anybody's introduction to it.

During the last war G.A.S. was commissioned by the Foreign Office and the American National Committee to lecture in America on the moral significance of the war. He addressed a hundred and twenty-seven meetings, and his dynamic personality and passionate faith made him perhaps the most successful of the leading men who crossed the Atlantic on behalf of the Allied Cause. The lectures, published under the title, *Our Common Conscience*, have a real significance for the situation to-day. Indeed there was a good deal of the Old Testament prophet about G.A.S. himself, and this fitted him to deal, as he has done so trenchantly, with the great preachers of the Old Covenant. In particular, he was urgent in declaring that while we must defend the rights of the common people we must be brave to declare their sins. The prophets had 'their strong conscience of the people's sins and civic duties: this is the harder and most misunderstood half of patriotism.' It may be of interest to mention that, when Professor Souter once asked G.A.S. whether he would write a commentary on Ezekiel, he replied that he could not do so as he had a temperamental aversion to that strange figure.

I have given a sufficient account of this delightful monograph by Professor Cook to send those who would like more to the lecture itself. What has been set down above is only a fragment. Those who knew the great Principal will agree with Professor Cook's eloquent conclusion. 'He was a fervent preacher, a fearless and loyal subject of his Church and country, a staunch upholder of ethical nationalism, an uncompromising defender of what he had found to be true. And such men as he are sorely needed in days of crisis.' F. J. R.

Records of Friendship.

The second volume of Sir Henry Newbolt's Memoirs, edited by his wife, has just been published (*The Later Life and Letters of Sir Henry Newbolt*). It is a book of great charm and wisdom—a book for browsing in. Newbolt himself suggested as the title 'Records of Friendship.' Amongst these friends—generous givers of themselves—we find Sir Edward Grey, John Buchan, Smuts, W. B. Yeats, Mary Coleridge, Hardy, and many others.

Sir Henry Newbolt was an old Cliftonian, and one of his last letters was to the editors of the School Magazine. It was written at the suggestion of Lord Haig who thought the importance of religion should be strongly impressed upon the school, and signed by Haig himself, Herbert Warren, J. H. Whitley, and Francis Younghusband. We quote a part of it. 'Life has become more controversial; controversy is more violent; the unintelligent are perverting science into a new form of superstition; religion is in danger of being crushed out between the materialistic selfishness of the rich and luxurious, and the materialistic hopes of the overworked and underpaid.

'For this feverish condition of society we have no new remedy to offer, but we are impelled to remind our fellow-Cliftonians of an old one. We who now write are men of different character and experiences, but we have at least this in common. In the last forty or fifty years we have lived through times of great national prosperity and still greater danger and anxiety. These years have convinced us all that no kind of life is complete, no kind of life can make the world intelligible or give us any lasting satisfaction, unless there enters into it the element which is called Religion. We are not speaking of this or that form of religion, but of the impulse which is expressed in all such forms: the desire to find God in the universe and to understand our relation to Him.'

General Smuts in 1918.

Smuts is certainly 'an attractive figure, and in spite of his slightly foreign accent he is just the ideal Englishman, half soldier, half statesman, and wholly straight, sensible, and modest. His speech was a *very* long one, but so vivid and full of intention and sincerity that I was thrilled to the very last word. He said, "England made a mistake in 1776" . . . . and I called out "and paid for it." "Yes," he said, "and paid for it; and then made—I may perhaps be permitted to think—another mistake in 1899" . . . I called out again "and paid again." He said (mishearing I suppose, but so neatly), "Yes, and played the game" . . . at which much cheering.'[1]

A Perpetual Memory.

Me at the dawn's first breath,
Thee in the dusk of death,
Thy love and my love tended.
We shall be mother and son
After all days are done
All darkness ended.[2]

[1] *The Later Life and Letters of Sir Henry Newbolt*, 254.
[2] *Ib.*, 280.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.